

2 kez

11.11.2012

U. Deniz Tuzan

125 936 - 41

**OKUMA DERSLERİNDE OKUMA ÖNCESİNDE
“DİNLEME ANLAMA” NIN KULLANILMASI**

**USING ‘LISTENING’ AS A PRE-
READING ACTIVITY IN THE
READING CLASSES**

HÜLYA İPEK
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)
Eskişehir, 1998

**T.C.
ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ**

**USING ‘LISTENING’ AS A PRE-READING ACTIVITY IN THE
READING CLASSES**

**OKUMA DERSLERİNDE OKUMA ÖNCESİNDE
“DİNLEME ANLAMA” NIN KULLANILMASI**

**BY
HÜLYA İPEK**

THESIS OF MASTER OF ARTS

**ADVISOR
Prof. Dr. Gül DURMUŞOĞLU**

Eskişehir 1998

Anadolu Üniversitesi
Merkez Kütüphane

ÖZET

Bu çalışma dinleme anlamanın okuma öncesi aşamada kullanılmasının okuma becerisine etkisini araştırılmak üzere yapılmıştır. Çalışma Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri ve Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerine yönelik Hazırlık programında gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Araştırmaya katılan öğrenciler İngilizce seviyelerine göre seçilmiştir. “Upper-Intermediate” düzeyinde olduğu bilinen iki grup öğrenci seçilmiştir. Deneklerin kesin seviyelerini belirlemek için araştırma öncesi deneklere Michigan seviye tespit sınavı verilmiştir. Her iki grupta 15 öğrencinin upper intermediate düzeyde olduğu tespit edilmiştir ve bu öğrenciler çalışmaya katılmak üzere seçilmiştir.

Araştırmanın öğretim öncesi aşamasında öğrencilere okumaya ilgi duydukları metin türlerini belirlemeyi amaçlayan bir anket verilmemiştir. Okuma parçaları hırsızlık, fast food, cinsel ayırım, ağrı kesiciler, evde çalışma ve deprem gibi konular içermektedir. Dinleme anlama parçaları da okuma parçaları ile aynı konuları içermektedir. Okuma parçaları ve dinleme - anlama parçaları upper-intermediate düzeyindeki öğrenciler için hazırlanmış olan ders kitaplarından alınmıştır. Okuma parçaları 350 ila 450 kelime içermektedirler ve dinleme anlama parçalarında 2 ila 3 dakika uzunluğundadırlar.

Araştırmada 6 okuma parçası kullanılmıştır. Araştırma boyunca çapraz desenleme yöntemi izlenmiştir. Bir grupta okuma öncesi aşamada dinleme anlama kullanılırken diğer grupta konuşma kullanılmıştır (bkz. 3.2). Her okuma parçasından sonra deneklere okudukları parçanın ne kadarını anladıklarını saptayan bir test verilmiştir. Bu test üç bölümden (5 anlama sorusu, 5 doğru / yanlış sorusu ve 5 bağlamdan sözcük anlamı çıkartma sorusu) ve 15 sorudan oluşmaktadır.

Altı saatlik bir  ğretim s recinden sonra test sonu ları istatistiksel olarak analiz edilmiřtir. İstatistiksel sonu lar okuma  ncesinde dinleme anlama veya konuřma kullanılmasının gruplar arasında okuma becerisinde bir fark yaratmadıėı g stermiřtir. Ancak, grup i erisinde bir grupta dinleme anlama sonrası okunulan par aların testlerinde daha y ksek notlar elde edilmesine raėmen diėer grupta konuřma sonrası okunulan par aların testlerinde daha y ksek notlar elde edilmiřtir. Sonu  olarak, arařtırmada anlamlı bir fark bulunamadıėı i in dinleme anlamanın da okuma  ncesi ařamada  n bilgi vermek amacıyla kullanılabileceėi sonucuna varılmıřtır.

comprehension questions, 5 true/false statements, and 5 guessing vocabulary items.

The results of the six texts were examined and analyzed statistically. The statistical results revealed that there was no difference between the groups in the comprehension of texts where listening for specific information was used and where a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage. However, a difference occurred within groups. While subjects in one group scored higher in tests given after texts where listening was used in the pre-reading stage, subjects in the other group scored higher in tests given after text where a short class discussion was used. Since there was no statistical difference on the effectiveness of one type of pre-reading activity on the other, it is concluded that, listening for specific information can also be used in the pre-reading stage as a substitution to speaking for building background knowledge.

Group A and Group B for Text 1	32
4.2.2 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1	33
4.2.3 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1	34
4.2.4 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2	35
4.2.5 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2	36
4.2.6 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2	37
4.2.7 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3	38
4.2.8 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3	39
4.2.9 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3	40
4.2.10 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4	41
4.2.11 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4	42
4.2.12 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4	43
4.2.13 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5	44
4.2.14 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5	45

4.2.15 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5	46
4.2.16 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6	47
4.2.17 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6	48
4.2.18 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6	49
4.3 Comparison of Test Results within Groups	50
4.3.1 Test Results within Group A	50
4.3.2 Test Results within Group B	51
4.4 Comparison of Test Components within Groups	52
4.4.1 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results within Group A for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6	53
4.4.2 Comparison of True/False Component Results within Group A for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6	53
4.4.3 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results within Group A for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6	54
4.4.4 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results within Group B for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6	55
4.4.5 Comparison of True/False Component Results within Group B for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6	56
4.4.6 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results within Group B for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6	57
4.5 Summary of Results	58
4.6 Discussion	59

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION	62
5.1 Summary of the Study	62
5.2 Conclusion	64
5.3 Suggestions for Further Research	65
REFERENCES	66
APPENDICES	72

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores	27
--	----

TABLE 2

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores	28
--	----

TABLE 3

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores	29
--	----

TABLE 4

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores	30
--	----

TABLE 5

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5 by Mean Scores	31
--	----

TABLE 6

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores	32
--	----

TABLE 7

Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores	33
---	----

TABLE 8

Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores	34
--	----

TABLE 9

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores	35
---	----

TABLE 10	
Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores	36
TABLE 11	
Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores	37
TABLE 12	
Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores	38
TABLE 13	
Comparison of Comprehension Question Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores	39
TABLE 14	
Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores	40
TABLE 15	
Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores	41
TABLE 16	
Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores	42
TABLE 17	
Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores	43
TABLE 18	
Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results Component between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores	44

TABLE 19	
Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5 by Mean Scores	45
TABLE 20	
Comparison of True/False Component Results Group A and Group B for Text 5 by Mean Scores	46
TABLE 21	
Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5 by Mean Scores	47
TABLE 22	
Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores	48
TABLE 23	
Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores	49
TABLE 24	
Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores	50
TABLE 25	
Test Results within groups for Texts 1,3,5 (listening) and 2,4,6 (speaking) in Group A by Mean Scores	51
TABLE 26	
Test Results within groups for Texts 1,3,5 (speaking) and Texts 2,4,6 (listening) in Group B by Mean Scores	52
TABLE 27	
Comparison of Comprehension Components within Group A for Texts 1, 3, 5 and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores	53

TABLE 28

Comparison of True/False Components within Group A for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores	54
--	----

TABLE 29

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Components within Group A for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores	55
---	----

TABLE 30

Comparison of Comprehension Components within Group B for Texts 1, 3, 5 and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores	56
--	----

TABLE 31

Comparison of True/False Questions Components within Group B for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores	57
--	----

TABLE 32

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Components within Group B for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores	58
---	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Problem

Reading is agreed to have two broad aspects. First, deciphering the marks on the page, the brain receiving signals from the eye and secondly, a cognitive task which is interpreting the visual information (Greenwood, 1990: 82). Kenneth Goodman (1967: 126; cited in Williams, 1991: 3) refers to reading as a 'psycholinguistic guessing game'. The 'guessing' is not random but it is principled guessing, which draws upon two sources to guide it: the text itself, and what the reader brings to the text. What the reader brings to the text are listed by Williams as follows: knowledge of the written language, knowledge of the language, ability to interpret, knowledge of the world, reasons for reading and reading style. This research is concerned with the knowledge of the world the reader brings to the text.

Research on the effects of prior knowledge on the comprehension of a reading text have shown positive results. Readers with knowledge about the content of the reading text have shown greater comprehension than readers without prior knowledge. Readers with high prior knowledge of content domain have well-developed schemata, or knowledge structures, into which they assimilate information from a text. In terms used by Voss, Vesonder, and Spilich (1980), information from the text is mapped onto the readers existing knowledge structures. Fincher - Kiefer, Post, Greene, and Voss (1988) determined that readers with prior knowledge of the content domain of a text interpret information from the text more quickly, and organize large chunks of the text for both comprehension and recall (cited in Afflerbach, 1990: 35).

A study carried out on the relationship between prior knowledge and the comprehension of news articles has revealed that lack of prior knowledge about cultural conventions and events make reading the news quite difficult for those with limited formal education, even when their decoding skills are well developed (Grebelksy, 1990 cited in Schumm, 1993: 557).

Prior knowledge has proved to have influence on the strategies used by expert readers to identify and state the main idea of a text when the main idea is implicit. If readers' prior knowledge for the text topic is not sufficient, the difficulty of main idea construction is compounded. Therefore, it is claimed that comprehension instruction should familiarize readers with the content domain of the text for which they must construct main idea statements (Afflerbach, 1990: 31-46).

"Providing information about the content of a reading selection before students read provides them with opportunities to gain new knowledge, as well as recall already existing knowledge, which they can take with them into their reading experience, and this knowledge facilitates successful comprehension (Gebhard, 1987: 22)".

It is in the pre-reading stage where the reader is provided information about the content of a reading selection before he/she reads the text. Pre-reading activities aiming to build background knowledge in order to facilitate successful comprehension are used in the pre-reading stage. There are various pre-reading activities aiming to build background knowledge among which are previews, pretests, and class discussions as suggested by Gebhard (1987: 21-23). Gebhard states that studies indicate that teachers can facilitate successful reading comprehension by providing previews of the reading to be dealt with, with the aim to give students an idea of what is to come.

The aim of pretests, which consist of questions related to the context of the text to be read, is to test students knowledge of the content before they read. As cited in Gebhard (1987), Sussex (1920) and Hartley and Davies (1976) suggest that pretests increase students' sensitivity to content and therefore students comprehend more of what they read.

Short class discussions can be carried out in order to activate students' existing knowledge and to provide an opportunity for students to consider their own experience in relation to the topic of reading (Gebhard, 1987: 21-23). The use of short class

discussions is also supported by Nuttal (1989: 154) who claims that, to find out whether students have the necessary background knowledge to understand a text, the best way is to ask the right questions to draw out the necessary information in order to build up a short class discussion.

Doff (1991: 60-61) suggests to introduce the theme of the text before students read it. He indicates that giving only a simple sentence could serve this aim. Yet, he suggests that a more interesting way would be to have a short class discussion in order to start students think about the topic. He also suggests giving students guiding questions before reading to have them think about as they read. Lewis and Hill (1992: 108) also support giving students guiding questions before they read.

Gower and Walters (1983: 143-145) suggest eliciting a few ideas from students about a context since it encourages a class to give some of its opinions and contribute some of its knowledge. A study carried out by Jecksembieyva (1993) with 79 English instructors at the Bilkent University revealed that 100% of the participants use pre-reading activities in their lessons and the most widely used pre-reading activity is discussion of real life experiences (73.41%). This activity is followed by making predictions (67.08%), pre-teaching vocabulary (64.55%) and asking questions (64.55%). Except the above mentioned pre-reading activities her study also included use of pictures, graphs and other illustrations; and class discussions related to the topic.

She mentions that research by Hudson (1982) and Johnson (1982) demonstrate that simply pre-teaching vocabulary is insufficient to improve overall comprehension; Hudson (1982) found that presenting pictures was more effective than presenting vocabulary for reading comprehension. She continues that asking questions related to the text before reading is supported by Singer (1978), Hansen (1981), Singer and Dolan (1982) who claim that the use of questions makes reading an active process and encourages both students and teachers. Taglieber, Johnson and Yarbrough (1988) found that pictorial context and pre-questioning are more effective than vocabulary pre-teaching.

Listening has been suggested as a pre-reading activity by Chela-Flores (1993: 22-27) where the listening task was based on phonological code recognition. Her aim was to have students recognize the phonological code of the English language since she argues

that once students recognize the phonological code of the English language their comprehension of the reading text increases. She based her listening tasks on the content of the script and the immediate needs of vocabulary and pronunciation. McCarthy (1995: 37) also used listening in the pre-reading stage where she had students listen to a story they were later going to read. McCarthy used listening tasks that focused students attention on main ideas and details, inferencing and predicting questions that enabled to access and modify schemata, sequencing activities that helped students reconstruct the events of the story, and summarizing the story.

While listening is used with the aim of building background knowledge in McCarthy's study, Chela_Flores does not use listening with the same aim. Since listening is regarded as a convenient pre-reading activity it might also be used with the aim to build background knowledge. McCarthy's study shows that using listening as a pre-reading activity to build background knowledge can have positive effects on reading comprehension. Before using listening to build background knowledge it is important to choose the listening task convenient for this purpose.

The following listening tasks are listed by Harmer (1991: 215-230):

- a. Listening to confirm expectations: with this task students gain a clear view of what it is they are going to listen to and have a purpose for listening.
- b. Listening to extract specific information: students listen to information they need, disregarding irrelevant information.
- c. Listening for communicative tasks: students perform communicative tasks where they work together to solve problems with what they hear.
- d. Listening for general understanding: students listen to get a general idea of what the main points are.
- e. Listening for detail: students listen to inferences and discourse structures.

Listening for specific information seems relevant for the purpose of building background information in the pre-reading stage, which is the concern of this research, since students are to listen to the extract in order to gain the necessary background information for the reading text, disregarding irrelevant information.

1.2. Problem

The importance of building background knowledge on the comprehension of a reading text has been stated by research. Various pre-reading activities have been applied in order to build background information (cf. Chapter II). Even for a native speaker, reading a text which is not familiar to the reader, can be a problem and may hinder comprehension (cf. Grebelsky, 1990).

Chela-Flores (1993: 24) indicates that "listening seems more convenient than speaking for ESP reading not only because the immediate goal is not oral production, but also because the listening activity seems to require from the foreign language learner more of a recognition of vocabulary for rapid learning than a sophisticated knowledge of syntax".

Oral class discussions with the aim to build background knowledge were favored so far as pre-reading activities since they give students the chance to express their knowledge about a topic and the chance to share this knowledge with their classmates. There are also examples of the use of listening in the pre-reading stage but not necessarily with the aim of building background knowledge.

Studies carried out on the use of listening as a pre-reading activity (cf. Chela-Flores, 1993; Williams, 1991; McCarthy, 1995) did not all aim to build background knowledge. Since there is little study focusing on the use of listening in the pre-reading stage with the aim of building background knowledge, it was thought to be worthwhile to study the effects of listening as a pre-reading activity on reading comprehension.

Since listening for specific information requires listening only to the necessary information to build background knowledge disregarding irrelevant information, this task is relevant for this study.

Because of the above mentioned reasons oral class discussion and listening for specific information, with the aim to build background knowledge, are to be compared in this study.

Whereas, listening as a pre-reading activity might have effects on the general comprehension of a reading text, it might also have effects on the test components separately, since each test component has different requirements from the students. Comprehension questions require students to produce responses in the foreign language

and they force students to think things out for themselves (Nuttal, 1989: 130). True/False questions require students to pay attention to important points in the text (Heaton, 1991: 113). Guessing vocabulary from context requires students to be aware of the other words in the text except those to be guessed, that is, they have to also understand the context in which the words are used (Hughes, 1989: 129; Heaton, 1990: 79).

1.3. Aim and Scope

This thesis aims to compare the effectiveness of two different pre-reading activities aiming to build background knowledge, namely listening to specific information from an extract related to the topic to be read and a short class discussion in the pre-reading stage. That is, the aim is to see whether there will be any difference in the comprehension of a reading text between the two groups of students when listening to specific information is used to build background knowledge or when a short class discussion is used.

The study was carried out with students enrolled in the English Preparatory Program of the Education Faculty and the Faculty of Communicational Sciences. The subjects were all at the upper-intermediate level of proficiency. The level of the subjects was determined by a pretest, the Michigan Placement Test. The reading and listening material used in class were all taken from coursebooks designed for students at the upper-intermediate level of proficiency. Gender difference was not taken into consideration during the study.

1.4 Research Question

To achieve the purpose of this study, the following questions will be answered:

Between Group Differences

1. Is there a difference between the total scores of subjects when listening is used as a pre-reading activity or when a class discussion is used as a pre-reading activity?
2. Is there a difference in means of each component, which are comprehension questions, true/false questions and guessing vocabulary, between Group A and Group B?

Within Group Differences

1. Is there a significant difference in the total scores of Group A in Texts 1,3,5 (when a listening extract is used as a pre-reading activity) and Texts 2,4,6 (when a short class discussion is used as a pre-reading activity)?
2. Is there a significant difference in the total scores of Group B in Texts 1,3,5 (when a short class discussion is used as a pre-reading activity) and Texts 2,4,6 (when a listening extract is used as a pre-reading activity)?
3. Is there a difference in means of each component, which are comprehension questions, true/false questions and guessing vocabulary, within Group A and Group B?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Approaches to Reading

“Reading is an exercise dominated by the eyes and the brain. The eyes receive messages and the brain then has to work out the significance of the message (Harmer, 1991: 190).”

In order to be able to receive messages and have the brain work these messages out, an effective reader knows, first of all, the written system of the language. He also knows the language of the text he is reading, that is, he knows the content words and what they mean, and he also knows the syntax of the language. The effective reader has the ability to interpret, that is, he recognizes the purpose of the text as a whole, sees how the text is organized, and understands the relationship between sentences. And, all readers bring something with them to a text, in terms of a general stock of knowledge, sometimes termed ‘knowledge of the world’ (Williams, 1991: 3-7).

Goodman (1971; cited in Coady, 1979: 135) defines reading as “a psychological process by which the reader, a language user, reconstructs, as best as he can a message which has been encoded by a writer as a graphic display.” Goodman (1970, 260; cited in Clarke and Silberstein, 1979: 48-65) adds, “reading is a selective process. It involves partial use of available minimum language cues selected from perceptual input on the basis of the reader’s expectation. As this partial information is processed, tentative decisions are made to be confirmed, rejected or refined as reading processes.

From the above statement, the following inferences can be drawn; first, reading is an active process. The reader forms a preliminary expectation about the material, then

selects the fewest, most productive cues necessary to confirm or reject that expectation, and this process is called a sampling process.

Second, the process of working through a reading task is often as important as producing correct responses to comprehension questions.

Third, reading involves an interaction between thought and language. Skill in reading depends on the interaction between linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the world, that is, students must have “conceptual readiness” for each task. Reading activities must either hook into students’ knowledge of the world, or the teacher must fill in the gaps before the task is begun.

Fourth, successful reading lessons depend on students’ efficient use of strategies and knowledge and on the nature of the reading passage (Clarke and Silberstein, 1979: 48-49).

Rivers (1968: 122-125) divides reading into two activities. In the first type of activity the student pronounces the sound symbolized by the written or printed marks on the script. This may be comprehensible and acceptable to the native speaker, but may lack the student drawing meaning from what he is reading. In the second type of activity the student derives meaning from the word combinations in the text at a reasonable speed, without necessarily vocalizing what he is reading. This second type of activity involves the extraction of three levels of meaning from the printed text: lexical meaning (the semantic content of the words and expressions), structural and grammatical meaning (deriving from interrelationships among words, or parts of words, or from the other words), and socio-cultural meaning (the evaluation which people of his own culture attach to the words or groups of words he is reading).

Dubin (1982: 125-128) claims that there should be three conditions to reading, which she identifies as maturation, motivation, and meaning. “First, a cognitive *maturation* must be reached before a child is ready to read. Second, *motivation* must be present. Third, *meaning*: the child must know in terms of real-world experience, the content of the reading, or at least a good deal of it.” With the last condition, she supports the issue of background knowledge.

She lists mature reading strategies as follows:

1. *Adjusting attention according to the material*

2. *Using the total context as an aid to comprehension*
3. *Skimming*
4. *Search Reading*
5. *Receptive Reading*
6. *Predicting / Guessing / Anticipating*
7. *Critical Reading*
8. *Scanning*
9. *Using Textual Discourse Devices*
10. *Synthesizing Knowledge*: Among these ten strategies, synthesizing knowledge is regarded as the most crucial strategy. In all reading, to get sense from the reading text, one should bring to the activity all of one's cultural knowledge and experience in the real world.

The literature supports the fact that the importance of background knowledge is emphasized. It is stated that in order to arrive at comprehending a reading text one has to have background knowledge on the content of the reading selection to be read. The reader either has this knowledge before he undertakes reading or this knowledge has to be provided. Providing a reader with background knowledge has many means (see 2.3).

Dubin (1982: 127) argues that, "the teacher can increase the students' motivation to read a difficult selection by providing background information through an overview of the contents. As much as possible, the learner should read about facts, events and ideas with which they are already familiar through their everyday lives."

2.2 The Importance of Background Knowledge in Reading

"Every act of comprehension involves one's knowledge of the world as well (Anderson, Reynolds, Schallert, and Goetz 1977:369, cited in Carrell and Eisterhold 1983: 553)." The importance of knowledge of the world, or background knowledge, in comprehension, both in the native and in the target language, has been supported by research and various tasks building the necessary background knowledge for comprehension have been designed.

Carrell et.al. (1983:553) claim that new information, new concepts, new ideas can have meaning only when they can be related to something the individual knows and

that this accounts not only for second language comprehension but also to comprehension in one's native language.

Schema theory suggests that comprehension is an active process which involves the learner's background knowledge and the text (oral or written). The learner cannot comprehend anything for which he or she does not have some kind of existing knowledge structure or schema. The comprehension process involves, assimilation of new knowledge into existing schemata and accommodation of existing schemata in order to fit new language (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992: 96). The reader brings to the task an impressive amount of information and ideas, attitudes and beliefs. This knowledge, combined with the ability to make linguistic predictions, determines the expectations the reader will develop as he reads. Skill in reading depends on the efficient interaction between linguistic knowledge and the knowledge of the world (Clarke et.al., 1977: 39; cited in Mackay, 1979: 51-52).

Williams (1984: 6-7) states that "all readers bring something with them to the text in terms of general stock of knowledge, sometimes termed as 'knowledge of the world'. Whether it helps them to understand the text or not will of course depend on the nature of the text and the nature of their knowledge." He argues that newspaper articles often assume the reader will have knowledge of the current political situation, or the world of entertainment and sport. This assumption can be a problem even for a reader who speaks the same language as the writer.

"The subject of reading material should be of high interest and relate well to the background of the reader, since strong semantic input can help compensate when syntactic control is weak. The interest and background knowledge will enable the student to comprehend at a reasonable rate and keep him involved in the material in spite of its syntactic difficulty (Coady 1979:12; cited in Mackay, 1979: 12).

With reference to reading comprehension, research shows that: (1) lack of schemata or the failure to activate an appropriate schemata can considerably impair comprehension; (2) appropriate content /rhetorical schema application can increase comprehension; (3) background knowledge can be as important as language ability in terms of comprehension; (4) comprehension is facilitated by explicitly inducing schemata through pre-reading activities (Scarcella et.al., 1992: 96).

Sometimes students do not have enough knowledge of the world to understand certain kinds of text and teachers must fill them in on what they need to focus on those concepts that are central to understanding the upcoming reading, concepts that learners do not possess or may not think of without prompting. Therefore, pre-reading activities are beneficial (Scarcella et.al., 1992: 107).

Research has shown that students with some background knowledge on the text to be read find it easier to comprehend the reading text. Grebelsky (1990, cited in Schumm, 1993: 557) states that lack of prior knowledge about cultural conventions and events as well as absence of concepts, some of which are most often learned in conventional school curriculums, make reading the news quite difficult for those with limited formal education, even when their decoding skills are well developed. His subjects were 60 women enrolled in an adult basic education program in Israel. The subjects were asked to read and retell three news articles from three areas - politics, economics, and human interests. His results revealed higher degree of comprehension in the human interest stories (75%) than in the politics (23%) and economics articles (5%).

A study carried out by Afflerbach (1990: 31-46) examined the influence of prior knowledge on the strategies used by expert readers to identify and state the main idea of a text when the main idea is implicit. At the end of the study, readers reported automatically constructing the main idea statement significantly more often when they had prior knowledge of the content domain of the text, whereas when they lacked such prior knowledge, they more often used the strategy of draft-and-revision. The results of this study demonstrate that if readers' prior knowledge for the text topic is not sufficient, the ability of main idea construction is restricted. Comprehension instruction should familiarize readers with the content domain of the text for which they must construct main idea statements.

Fincher-Kiefer, Post, Greene, and Voss (1988; cited in Afflerbach, 1990: 35) determined that readers with prior knowledge of the content domain of a text interpret information from the text more quickly and organize large chunks of the text for both comprehension and retrieval.

In accordance with the findings on the effect of background knowledge on reading comprehension, the design of teaching material as well as the teaching (mainly

pre-reading activities) itself, has to be reorganized, too. That is, students have to be provided with some way of getting prepared to the material to be read so that their comprehension is promoted. Several activities have been suggested by researchers.

Researchers have argued that giving students pretests or behavioral objectives, or overviews and advance organizers before instruction can significantly aid subsequent learning (Hartley and Davies, 1976: 239-265). Among the other suggested pre-reading activities are previews, pretests, short class discussions, guiding questions, eliciting, and listening (see 2.3).

“Providing information about the content of a reading selection before students read provides them with opportunities to gain new knowledge, as well as recall already existing knowledge, which they can take with them into their reading experience, and this knowledge facilitates successful comprehension (Gebhard, 1987: 22).”

2.3 Various Ways for Building Background Knowledge

It is claimed that preinstructional strategies serve three main purposes: a) they help familiarize students with the content of the learning task they are to undertake; b) they serve as a framework on which subsequent learning can be arranged and relate what has to be learned to what is already known; c) they can increase the clarity and stability of new material so that learning is strengthened and forgetting reduced.

Preinstructional strategies should be used when what has to be learned matches or interacts with the learner's existing knowledge structure, and are more likely to be useful in situations calling for meaningful rather than rote learning (Hartley et.al., 1976: 246-257).

Williams (1991: 37-38) states the aim of the pre-reading phase tries to; a) introduce and arise interest in the topic; b) motivate learners by giving reasons for reading; c) provide some language preparation for the text. He suggests that visuals (e.g. diagrams, maps, photographs), drawing up of lists, or the setting or answering of questions (oral or written) may all play a part in pre-reading.

Gebhard (1987: 21-23) suggests three ways that provide background information; previews, pretests, and short class discussions. Previews, also termed as overviews, have the aim to familiarize students with the content of the reading text. They

prepare students for the general structure of the material to be mastered. Previews can be given verbally, in written form, or in the form of pictures that give students an idea of what it is to come (cf. Hartley et al., 1976: 239-265).

Pretests are defined as “any set of related questions, given before instruction, that is directly relevant to the knowledge, attitude, or skill domain to be acquired.” The aim of pretests is to define what students already know of the material to be taught (Hartley et al., 1976: 239-265). Research has found that pretests increase students sensitivity to content and that students consequently comprehend more of what they read (Gebhard, 1987: 21-23).

Short class discussions can be directed at activating students’ existing knowledge and increasing sensitivity to the content of the reading material. Factual information can be introduced. Class discussions also provide an opportunity for students to consider their own experience in relation to the topic of reading.

Other suggestions for building background information come from Nuttal (1989: 154). “Some texts are difficult to understand if you do not know the background and it may not be possible to deduce enough information from the text itself. In such cases, of course it is sensible to make sure that the students have the necessary facts; but try to find out if they can give you the facts - someone almost always can, if you ask the right questions. The best introductions are the ones that come mostly from the class, with the teacher simply drawing them out. A monologue from you is not so likely to kindle out curiosity as a discussion in which everyone is involved; some teachers have successfully used debate or role-playing as a way of getting the class into a receptive frame of mind for the text .”

Other ways of introducing the theme of a text were suggested by Doff (1991: 60-61). He states that one way to introduce a text is just to give a simple sentence, however, that a more interesting way would be to have a short class discussion to start students thinking about the topic. He also suggests giving students guiding questions to think about as they read. He states the purpose of these questions as “a. to give students a reason to read, by giving them something to look for as they read the text, b. to lead students towards the main points of the text, so that after the first reading they should have a good general idea of what it is about”.

Eliciting a few ideas from students about a context is also seen as a useful way of building background knowledge. The advantages of eliciting are (a) getting the students involved in the context and bringing relevant information to the front of their minds; (b) increasing the amount of talk; (c) telling you how much they know and can say in relation to it (Gower and Walters, 1983, p. 143). Eliciting gives a class the necessary and motivating feeling of being encouraged to give some opinions and contribute some knowledge so that what happens seems to depend partly on students themselves.

Jecksembieyva (1993: 21-22) investigated what kind of pre-reading activities are used more widely by teachers and found that discussion of real life experience is used most widely. And the pre-reading activities she investigated were;

Introduction and discussion of vocabulary: students may be introduced to and work on relevant vocabulary before reading the appropriate passage or text.

Use of pictures, graphs, and other illustrations: they are used to clarify the subject matter, arouse interest in the subject and focus attention on a text before reading it. Another aim of these illustrations is to stimulate and assist the reader in comprehending the text.

Asking questions related to the text: this pre-reading activity focuses attention on general comprehension goals and prepares students for the reading text. These questions are used to stimulate interest, to predict what might come next, and to elicit prior information.

Asking students to make predictions about the text based on the text title or illustrations: this activity aims to encourage students to guess, or to improve students' capacity to make predictions about a text before reading it.

Class discussions related to the topic: this activity is used to activate students' awareness of the subject and give them a focus for reading.

Discussion of real-life experience related to the text: this activity motivates and prepares students with an introductory discussion of students' personal experience related to the topic.

Chela-Flores (1993: 22-23) states that using listening as a pre-reading activity has its advantages. One advantage of listening over speaking is that the immediate goal in listening is not oral production and that listening requires more of a recognition of vocabulary for rapid comprehension than a sophisticated knowledge of syntax, which is

the case in speaking. Another advantage of listening is the commonality of processing that seems to exist between listening and reading. It has been suggested that information processing in listening influences processing in reading and vice versa (Seidenberg et al. 1982, Swinney 1979); gains from instruction in a listening skill (e.g., listening for the main idea) should transfer to performance in the same skill in reading (Sticht and James, 1984; cited in Chela-Flores, 1993).

In the study carried out by Chela-Flores (1993), listening was used as a pre-reading activity. The listening tasks were based on phonological code recognition. She argues that, if students recognize the phonological code of the English language and its difference from the written form, their comprehension of the reading text increases. The listening in her study was based on the content of the script and the immediate needs of vocabulary and pronunciation. Chela-Flores concluded from her findings that an ESP reading program would benefit if it is complemented with listening based techniques related to the reading material and the students' level in audio comprehension.

Williams (1984: 31-33) designed a lesson where he used listening prior to reading with the aim to familiarize students with the content of the reading selection. The topic of this lesson was tourism and travel, and the steps of this lesson can be listed as follows:

1. skimming and scanning work with authentic travel brochures
2. planning a holiday based on more intensive reading of parts of the asme brochure
3. writing imaginary postcards
4. listening work with a tape simulated authentic conversation between a hotel manager and a dissatisfied guest
5. a reading debating the value of travel for the tourist, the text was exploited first for rapid reading, involving identification of the main point in each paragraph, then more intensive reading with comprehension questions and work on vocabulary in context
6. guided discussion based on points form the text

McCarthy (1995: 37) recommends using listening as a pre-reading activity for building background information. She designed a reading class, where she was going to have students read and listen to the same story, with the following aims in mind: "I wanted to (a) help my students develop vocabulary and schemata to facilitate both bottom-up and top-down processing; (b) develop learning strategies that could be

transferred to their reading experiences; c) spark interest in reading by providing enjoyable, comprehensible reading material; and (d) give them an enjoyable break from the intensive academic listening activities that dominate our class work.” She states that, although hearing the story gave students overall comprehension, reading allowed them to uncover details they may have missed or not fully comprehended during the listening phase. She argues that, listening to a text prior to reading it can reduce anxiety about the reading process, promote the development of learning strategies that can be applied to reading material, and create positive reading experiences.

The use of listening as a pre-reading activity has been suggested by research, however, not with the aim of building background knowledge, except a study carried out by McCarthy. Therefore, a study on the effects of using listening as a pre-reading activity with the aim to build background knowledge may have fruitful results.

There are various listening tasks that might be used in the pre-reading stage with the aim of building background knowledge. Harmer (1991: 215-230) lists the following listening tasks:

- a. Listening to confirm expectations: With this task students expectations and interests are aroused. Students gain a clear view of what it is they are going to listen to and have a purpose for listening.
- b. Listening to extract specific information: Here, students listen to the information they need, disregarding irrelevant information. Scarcella et.al. (1992: 146-147) state that this is a discrimination task that emphasizes on separating the important from the unimportant. The learners pay attention to those details only and filter out anything that does not directly relate to the important information.
- c. Listening for communicative tasks: Students perform communicative tasks with what they hear. Rixon (1991: 88-89) states that students obey instructions in these tasks and that those tasks provide them with immediate feedback on how good their listening has been.
- d. Listening for general understanding: Students listen to get the general picture without getting too stuck on individual words and phrases.
- e. Listening for details: In this task students listen for inferences and discourse structures. Rixon (1991: 92-94) adds that to arrive at an inference, a listener needs to

take two or more pieces of information that he has understood from the words of a text and combine them to reach a conclusion not actually given in so many words in the passage.

From the above mentioned listening tasks, listening for specific information is suitable for the aim of this study since students only need to listen to the information they need to understand the listening task.

Previews can be carried out orally, in written form or with visual realia with or without words. Pretests are also in written form. Short class discussions, on the other hand, are done orally. Visuals, drawing up lists, setting or answering questions (cf. Williams, 1991: 37-38), and eliciting information from students (cf. Gover & Walters, 1983: 110, 143-145) may play a part in pre-reading. As can be seen above, reading, speaking, and writing (cf. Kauffman, 1996) are used as means to building background knowledge before reading a text. Listening is rarely used as a means to building background information.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selection of Subjects

The subjects were students in the English preparatory program. There are 21 students in one group and 20 students in the other. In each group there is one student from the Communication Sciences Faculty; the rest of the students are from the Education Faculty, English Teaching Department. These students are between the ages of 17 to 20. They are exposed to 24 to 26 hours of English instruction per week. Their courses consist of listening, reading, writing, grammar, and speaking. The five language skills are taught separately.

The Michigan placement test was administered to the subjects to see whether they were at the same level of proficiency or not. The placement test results revealed that both groups - the control group and the experimental group - are at the upper-intermediate level of proficiency which ranges between 61 and 75 points. Students having marks below 61 or above 75 were not taken into consideration during the study. This was done in order to carry out a feasible study. Therefore, the number of subjects in the study was 15 students in each group, Group A and Group B. The listening scores of the selected subjects were also approximately the same, which proves that the subjects' listening proficiency is at the same level (see Appendix A).

The evaluation scale for the placement test is not the original one. Instead, the evaluation scale suggested by the ELT Department Administration has been used. The reason for this is that the original scale does not reflect the proficiency level of Turkish students. The altered scale has been used successfully for the past eight years in the English preparatory program. The evaluation scale in consideration is as follows:

76 - 100	advanced
61 - 75	upper-intermediate
46 - 60	intermediate
31 - 45	low-intermediate
16 - 30	elementary
0 - 15	beginner

3.2 Research Design

In this study, two intact groups at the same proficiency level were compared. In each group 6 reading texts were used.

Both groups were given background knowledge on the reading text to be dealt with; but the means in doing this was different. The aim of this study is to find out whether there is a difference in reading comprehension between the group where a listening extract with the task listening for specific information is used as a pre-reading activity and the group where a short class discussion is used as a pre-reading activity.

In the pre-reading stage, while in Group A listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity for the reading Text 1, in Group B a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity for the same reading text. Then in Group B listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity for the reading Text 2 while in Group A a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity for the Reading Text 2. This design has been carried out for 6 reading texts. The design is outlined below:

	Group A	Group B
Text 1	listening for specific information	short class discussion
Text 2	short class discussion	listening for specific information
Text 3	listening for specific information	short class discussion
Text 4	short class discussion	listening for specific information
Text 5	listening for specific information	short class discussion
Text 6	short class discussion	listening for specific information

This design was used to account for students individual differences, regarding their listening and reading texts.

3.3 Materials

The reading and listening material were selected from coursebooks especially designed for students at the upper-intermediate level. Both the listening and reading texts were on similar topics. The reading texts were all at the same length, 350 to 450 words, and at the same difficulty level. This was obtained by applying the 'Word Count' program found under Word 6.0 to each reading text. The listening extracts were also all at the same duration, that is between 2 to 3 minutes.

Although no interest survey was given to the students, the reading texts were selected according to general interest topics of young adults. Both the reading texts and the listening extracts were selected from coursebooks especially designed for students at the upper-intermediate level. The following topics were thought to be appropriate for the study: crime - burglary, natural disasters, health, food, pain killers, sex discrimination (see Appendix B).

3.4 Procedures

Subjects were exposed to 6 different reading texts with accompanying pre-reading activities; either a short class discussion or listening for specific information.

While with students in Group A listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity for the Reading Text 1, in Group B a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity for the Reading Text 1. Then, in Group B listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity for the Reading Text 2 while in Group A short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity for the same reading text. This procedure was carried out for 6 reading texts.

In the group where a listening activity was carried out, students were asked to listen to an extract (see Appendix C) relevant to the topic to be read about. While listening, students were asked to answer questions on the listening extracts (see Appendix B). The questions and students answers were in written form. Students listened to the extract three times. This activity lasted for 10 minutes. Later, the answers to the questions were collected by the teacher and were not discussed in class.

In the group where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity, students were asked some guiding questions that would enable them to express their

thoughts and ideas on the topic to be dealt with (see Appendix B). Yet, these guiding questions required information similar to the information provided in the listening extracts. As Nuttal (1989: 154) states, the teacher should try to find out if students have the necessary background knowledge on a topic by asking the right questions. The answers of the students were quite similar to the information in the listening extracts. This question and answer procedure was carried out for 10 minutes. None of the students responses were written on the board. The whole activity was carried out orally.

After the pre-reading activity the reading text was handed out. Students were given 10 minutes to read the text. Later, the questions on the text were handed out and students were given 20 minutes to answer the questions, with the text in front of them. After answering the questions, the question sheets together with the answers were collected by the teacher, and the answers to each question were discussed as a class.

The types of questions were comprehension questions, true/false questions, and guessing vocabulary from context. The number of comprehension questions, true/false questions, and the number of vocabulary to be guessed from the text were the same for each reading text, that is, 5 comprehension questions, 5 true/false questions, and 5 vocabulary from context.

The types of questions were not selected randomly but are based on the following arguments: Comprehension questions were used in the study since their answers represent the general message the text intends to get through. The danger with comprehension questions or short answer questions is that a student who has the answer in his or her head after reading the relevant part of the passage may not be able to express it well (Hughes, 1989). However, this danger is not present with the subjects in question. The subjects are at a level of proficiency which enables them to express themselves clearly. Furthermore, they were trained in their previous reading classes to give clear answers to comprehension questions using their own words.

Heaton (1991: 113) states that the disadvantage of true/false questions is that it can encourage guessing, since testees have a 50 percent chance of giving a correct answer for each item. On the contrary, true/false questions can be used as a valuable testing device with which the students' attention is directed to the important points in the extract by means of true/false items.

Heaton (1988: 60) states that the most useful type in testing vocabulary from context is the type of matching items based on a reading comprehension passage, since a detailed context is provided by the passage to figure out the meaning of a word.

The study was carried out in 45-minute class sessions. Both groups were instructed by the same teacher. In one group the teacher carried out a listening task as a pre-reading activity. Students listened to the extract three times and answered the related questions. The answers to the questions on the listening extract were collected by the teacher. Later, students read the text and carried out the required instructions.

In the other group, students were asked questions for a short class discussion as a pre-reading activity. The aim here was to have students express their knowledge on the topic to be dealt with and share this knowledge with their classmates. Then, the students were given the same reading text as Group A and were asked to answer the test questions.

The pre-reading activities lasted for 10 minutes and the 35 minutes left were used to read the text and to answer the test questions.

After students carried out the instructions, their written answers to the questions were collected by the teacher. The teacher checked the answers to the questions after each class instruction. Each answer sheet was evaluated by the same teacher. It was checked how many of the questions were answered correctly by each student.

Both groups were instructed by the same teacher and the answers were also evaluated by the same teacher.

3.5 Data Analysis

The purpose of this study is to find out whether there will be a significant difference in the comprehension of a reading text between the group that is exposed to a listening task, listening for specific information, as a pre-reading activity and the group that is exposed to a short class discussion, guided by the teacher, as a pre-reading activity.

To achieve this goal, the groups were asked to read 6 texts and at the end of each reading text students had to answer the test questions.

The answers to the questions at the end of each reading text were evaluated as follows: it was determined how many questions out of 15 were answered correctly.

The difference between the scores of the groups in comprehending the reading texts were tested by using the t-test for independent samples.

The results of each component, namely comprehension questions, true/false question, guessing vocabulary from context, in each reading text of the two groups were examined by using the t-test for independent samples.

The difference between the scores within the groups were tested by using the t-test for correlated samples.

The results of each component in each reading text within the two groups were examined by using the t-test for correlated samples.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to compare the effect of two different pre-reading activities, namely listening and speaking on reading comprehension. Therefore, it is aimed to examine whether there is a difference in reading comprehension between the group in which a listening extract related to the topic to be read, with the aim of listening for specific information, is used as a pre-reading activity and the group in which speaking, as a short class discussion, is used in the pre-reading stage.

This chapter will deal with the analysis of the data gathered from 30 different subjects studying Reading Comprehension at the preparation program of the Education Faculty and the Communication Sciences Faculty, Anadolu University.

The analysis of the data will be dealt with in terms of :

- 1) Difference between the scores of the test results of the two groups, Group A and Group B, in comprehending the reading texts.
- 2) Difference in results between each test component (that is, comprehension questions, true/false questions, guessing vocabulary from context) in each test for each text between the two groups, Group A and Group B.
- 3) Difference between the scores of the test results within each group in comprehending the reading texts.
- 4) Difference in results between each test component (that is, comprehension questions, true/false questions, guessing vocabulary from context) in each test for each text within the two groups, Group A and Group B.

4.1 Comparison of the Test Results between Group A and Group B

Each test consists of three components: the comprehension questions component which consists of five questions, the true/false questions component which consists of five statements, and the guessing vocabulary from context component which consists of five vocabulary whose meaning is guessed. Each test component was given 5 points, consequently each question was worth 1 point. If a question required more than one answer then the point of the question, in this case 1, was divided by the number of answers required by the question. That is, if the subject has to list four items in a question, then each item would be worth 0,25 points. The highest score subjects could get for each component was 5 since each component consists of five questions, and the lowest score was 0 for those subjects who could not provide an acceptable answer. The highest total score a subject could get on a test was, therefore, 15 and the lowest score was 0.

In order to obtain the mean of the group for each test the total score of each subject was added up and divided by the total number of subjects which is 15 (cf. Appendix D). Therefore, the symbol 'n' in this section represents the number of subjects. The total score of each subject was calculated as follows; the points of the subject for each question were added up (cf. Appendix D).

In this section, the means of each group, Group A and Group B, for each text test will be compared.

4.1.1 Test Results for Text 1

The lowest score achieved in Group A was 9,75, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 13,75, achieved by one subject. The rest of the students scored between 10 and 13. Seven subjects achieved scores ranging from 11 to 11,75 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score achieved in Group B was 8,75, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 14, achieved by four subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 11 and 13. Eleven subjects achieved scores ranging from 12 to 14 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

In order to see whether these findings reveal a difference between Group A, where a listening extract was used in the pre-reading stage, and Group B, where speaking was used, we look at TABLE 1.

TABLE 1

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
Group A (n= 15)	11,81	-0,65
Group B (n= 15)	12,46	

$t = 1,39$ $p = 0,176$

As indicated in TABLE 1, the mean score of the test for Group A is calculated as 11,81 and for Group B as 12,46. There is a -0,65 difference between the means of the two groups. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0.05 level, ($t = 1,39$; $p = 0,176$).

The above results show that there is no difference in comprehension between the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity (Group A) and the group where a short class discussion was used (Group B).

4.1.2 Test Results of Text 2

The lowest score achieved in Group A was 3, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 11, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 4 and 9,50. Ten subjects achieved scores ranging from 7 to 9 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score achieved in Group B was 3, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 11, achieved by one subject. The remaining thirteen subjects scored between 6 and 9. Eleven subjects achieved scores ranging from 6 to 8 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

TABLE 2 shows whether these findings reveal a difference between Group A and Group B in the comprehension of Text 2.

TABLE 2

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
Group A (n=15)	7,43	0,23
Group B (n=15)	7,20	

$t = 0,33$ $p = 0,745$

As indicated in TABLE 2, the mean score of the test for Group A is calculated as 7,43 and for Group B as 7,20. There is a 0,23 difference between the means of the two groups. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0.05 level, ($t = 0,33$; $p = 0,745$).

The above results show that there is no difference in comprehension between the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity (Group A) and the group where a short class discussion was used (Group B).

4.1.3 Test Results of Text 3

The lowest score achieved in Group A was 4,5, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 13, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 6 and 12. Six subjects achieved scores ranging from 10 to 11 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score achieved in Group B was 6,60, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 14, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 7 and 11. Three subjects achieved 9 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

TABLE 3 shows whether there is a difference between Group A, where a listening for specific information was used in the pre-reading stage, and Group B, where a short class discussion was used, in the comprehension of Text 3.

TABLE 3**Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores**

	Mean	Mean Difference
Group A (n=15)	9,38	0,08
Group B (n=15)	9,29	

 $t = 0,12$ $p = 0,746$

As indicated in TABLE 3, the mean score of the test for Group A is calculated as 9,38 and for Group B as 9,29. There is a 0,08 difference between the means of the two groups. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0.05 level, ($t = 0,12$; $p = 0,746$).

These results indicate that there is no difference in comprehension between the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity (Group A) and the group where a short class discussion was used (Group B). That is, there is no difference in comprehension between the two groups.

4.1.4 Test Results of Text 4

The lowest score achieved in Group A was 5, achieved by two subjects, and the highest score was 10, achieved by one subject. The rest of the students scored between 6 and 9. Ten subjects achieved scores ranging from 6 to 8 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score achieved in Group B was 5, achieved by three subjects, and the highest score was 13, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 6 and 12. Eight subjects achieved scores ranging from 7 to 9 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

TABLE 4 shows whether there is a difference between Group A, where listening for specific information was used in the pre-reading stage, and Group B, where a short class discussion was used, in the comprehension of Text 4.

TABLE 4**Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores**

	Mean	Mean Difference
Group A (n=15)	7,13	-0,66
Group B (n=15)	7,80	

t = 0,88

p = 0,386

As indicated in TABLE 4, the mean score of the test for Group A is calculated as 7,13 and for Group B as 7,80. There is a -0,66 difference between the means of the two groups. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0.05 level, ($t = 0,88$; $p = 0,386$).

These results indicate that there is no difference in comprehension between the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity (Group A) and the group where a short class discussion was used (Group B).

4.1.5 Test Results of Text 5

The lowest score achieved in Group A was 9, achieved by five subjects, and the highest score was 13, achieved by three subjects (cf. Appendix E).

The lowest score achieved in Group B was 7, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 14, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 9 and 13. Seven subjects achieved 11 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

In order to see whether there is a difference between Group A, where a listening extract was used in the pre-reading stage, and Group B, where speaking was used, in the comprehension of Text 5, we need to look at TABLE 5.

TABLE 5**Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5 by Mean Scores**

	Mean	Mean Difference
Group A (n=15)	10,86	-0,33
Group B (n=15)	11,20	

t = -0,54

p = 0,594

As seen in TABLE 5, the mean score of the test for Group A is calculated as 10,86 and for Group B as 11,20. There is a -0,33 difference between the means of the two groups. Yet, There is no statistically significant difference at level 0.05, (t = -0,54; p = 0,594).

These results indicate that there is no difference in comprehension between the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity (Group A) and the group where a short class discussion was used (Group B). That is, there is no difference in comprehension between the two groups.

4.1.6 Test Results of Text 6

The lowest score achieved in Group A was 9,5, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 15, achieved by one subject. The rest of the students scored between 10,50 and 14,50. Four subjects achieved 12 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score achieved in Group B was 9,5, achieved by one subject, and the highest score was 15, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 11,50 and 14,50. Four subjects achieved scores ranging from 12 to 12,50 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

TABLE 6 shows whether there is a difference between Group A, where a listening extract was used in the pre-reading stage, and Group B, where speaking was used, in the comprehension of Text 6.

TABLE 6

Test Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
Group A (n=15)	12,60	-0,53
Group B (n=15)	13,13	

$t = 0,96$ $p = 0,344$

As indicated in TABLE 6, the mean score of the test for Group A is calculated as 12,60 and for Group B as 13,13. There is a -0,53 difference between the two groups. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = 0,96$; $p = 0,344$).

These results indicate that there is no difference in comprehension between the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity (Group A) and the group where a short class discussion was used (Group B).

4.2 Comparison of Every Single Component between Groups

In the following section the test components comprehension (henceforth c), true/false (henceforth tf), and guessing vocabulary (henceforth v), will be compared between Group A (henceforth A) and Group B (henceforth B) for text 1 (henceforth 1), text 2 (henceforth 2), text 3 (henceforth 3), text 4 (henceforth 4), text 5 (henceforth 5), text 6 (henceforth 6).

To achieve the mean of each component, the following calculations were carried out: the points of each subject for the component in question were added up and divided by the number of subjects which is 15. Therefore, the symbol 'n' in this section represents the number of subjects who have taken the test.

4.2.1 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 1 in Group A is 1,75, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by one subject. The

rest of the subjects scored between 2,75 and 4,75. Six subjects achieved scores ranging from 3,75 to 4 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 1 in Group B is 3,75, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by five subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 4 and 4,75. Seven subjects achieved 4 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

In order to see whether there is a difference between comprehension Component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 1, we need to look at TABLE 7.

TABLE 7

Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
c1.A (n=15)	3,68	-0,71
c1.B (n=15)	4,40	

$t = -2,84$ $p = 0,309$

As TABLE 7 reveals, the mean score of comprehension component results for Text 1 in Group A is 3,68 and 4,40 in group B. There is a -0,71 difference between the means of the two comprehension components. Yet, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -2,84$; $p = 0,309$).

These results show that there is no difference between comprehension component results for Text 1 in Group A and Group B

4.2.2 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 1 in Group A is 3, achieved by three subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by four subjects. Eight subjects achieved 4 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 1 in Group B is 2, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by five subjects. Ten subjects achieved scores ranging from 5 to 4 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

In order to see whether there is a difference between true/false component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 1, we look at TABLE 8.

TABLE 8

Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf1.A (n=15)	4,07	0,13
tf1.B (n=15)	3,93	

$t = 0,43$ $p = 0,186$

As TABLE 8 reveals, the mean score of true/false component results for Text 1 in Group A is 4,07 and 3,93 in Group B. There is a 0,13 difference between the means of the true/false component in Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 0,43$; $p = 0,186$).

These results show that there is no difference between true/false component results for Text 1 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.3 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1

The score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 1 in Group A are 4 and 5. Fourteen subjects scored 4 and one subject scored 5 (cf. Appendix E).

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 1 in Group B is 3, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by three subjects. Eleven subjects achieved 4 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

TABLE 9 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 1.

TABLE 9

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 1 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
v1.A (n=15)	4,07	-0,06
v1.B (n=15)	4,13	

$t = -0,45$ $p = 0,057$

As TABLE 9 reveals, the mean score of guessing vocabulary component results for Text 1 in Group A is 4,07 and 4,13 in Group B. There is a -0,06 difference between the means of the true/false component in Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 0,45$; $p = 0,057$).

These results show that there is no difference between guessing vocabulary component results for Text 1 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.4 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 2 in Group A is 1, achieved by three subjects, and the highest score is 4, achieved by two subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 1 and 3,5. Six subjects achieved 3 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 2 in Group B is 1, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 2 and 4. Seven subjects achieved 2 (cf. Appendix E), and this constitutes the majority of the subjects.

In order to see whether there is a difference between comprehension component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 2, we look at TABLE 10.

TABLE 10

Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
c2.A (n=15)	2,57	-0,10
c2.B (n=15)	2,67	

$t = -0,27$ $p = 0,964$

As TABLE 10 reveals, the mean score of comprehension component results for Text 2 in Group A is 2,57 and 2,67 in Group B. There is a -0,10 difference between the means of the true/false component in Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -0,27$; $p = 0,964$).

These results show that there is no difference between true/false component results for Text 2 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.5 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 2 in Group A is 2, achieved by three subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by three subjects. Three subjects scored 3 and seven subjects scored 4 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of students.

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 2 in Group B is 2, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by three subject. Four subjects scored 3 and seven subjects scored 4 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of students.

In order to see whether there is a difference between true/false component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 2, we look at TABLE 11.

TABLE 11

Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf2.A (n=15)	3,73	-0,06
tf2.B (n=15)	3,80	

$t = -0,20$ $p = 0,654$

As TABLE 11 reveals, the mean score of true/false component results for Text 2 in Group A is 3,73 and 3,80 in Group B. There is a -0,06 difference between the means of the true/false component in Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -0,20$; $p = 0,654$).

These results show that there is no difference between true/false component results for Text 2 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.6 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 2 in Group A is 0, achieved by four subjects, and the highest score is 3, achieved by one subject. Four subjects scored 2 and six subjects scored 1 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of students.

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 2 in Group B is 0, achieved by six subjects, and the highest score is 2, achieved by two subjects. Seven subjects scored 1 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of students.

TABLE 12 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 2.

TABLE 12

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 2 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
v2.A (n=15)	1,13	0,40
v2.B (n=15)	0,73	

$t = 1,34$ $p = 0,465$

As TABLE 12 reveals, the mean score of Guessing vocabulary results for Text 2 in Group A is 1,13 and 0,73 in Group B. There is a 0,40 difference between the means of the guessing vocabulary component in Group A and the guessing vocabulary component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 1,34$; $p = 0,465$).

These results show that there is no difference between guessing vocabulary results for Text 2 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.7 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 3 in Group A is 2,5, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by four subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 2,8 and 4. Seven subjects achieved scores ranging from 4 to 5 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 3 in Group B is 2,6, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by two subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 2,8 and 4. Seven subjects achieved scores ranging from 4 to 5 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

In order to see whether there is a difference between comprehension component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 3, we look at TABLE 13.

TABLE 13

Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
c3.A (n=15)	3,78	0,08
c3.B (n=15)	3,69	

$t = 0,29$ $p = 0,289$

As TABLE 13 reveals, the mean score of comprehension component results for Text 3 in Group A is 3,78 and 3,69 in Group B. There is a 0,08 difference between the means of the comprehension component in Group A and the guessing vocabulary component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 0,29$; $p = 0,289$).

These results show that there is no difference between comprehension component results for Text 3 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.8 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 3 in Group A is 1, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by four subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 2 and 4. Eight subjects achieved scores ranging from 4 to 5 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 3 in Group B is 2, achieved by two subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by five subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 3 and 4. Eleven subjects achieved scores ranging from 4 to 5 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

In order to see whether there is a difference between true/false component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 3, we look at TABLE 14.

TABLE 14

Comparison of True/False Components Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf3.A (n=15)	3,87	-0,06
tf3.B (n=15)	3,93	

$t = -0,17$ $p = 0,948$

As TABLE 14 reveals, the mean score of true/false component results for Text 3 in Group A is 3,87 and 3,93 in Group B. There is a -0,06 difference between the means of the true/false component in Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -0,17$; $p = 0,948$).

These results show that there is no difference between the true/false component results for Text 3 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.9 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 3 in Group A is 0, achieved by two subjects, and the highest score is 3, achieved by six subjects. One subject scored 2 and six subjects scored 1. The majority of subjects achieved scores ranging from 4 to 5 (cf. Appendix E).

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 3 in Group B is 0, achieved by four subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by one subjects. The rest of the subjects scored between 1 and 4, ten subjects. twelve subjects achieved scores ranging from 0 to 2 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

TABLE 15 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 3.

TABLE 15

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 3 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
v3.A (n=15)	1,73	0,06
v3.B (n=15)	1,67	

$t = 0,14$ $p = 0,680$

As TABLE 15 reveals, the mean score of guessing vocabulary component results for Text 3 in Group A is 1,73 and 1,67 in Group B. There is a 0,06 difference between the means of the guessing vocabulary component in Group A and the guessing vocabulary component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 0,14$; $p = 0,680$).

These results show that there is no difference between the guessing vocabulary component results for Text 3 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.10 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 4 in Group A is 1, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 4, achieved by six subjects. Four subjects scored 2 and four subjects scored 3. The majority of subjects achieved 4 (cf. Appendix E).

The lowest score for the comprehension component for text 3 in Group B is 1, achieved by three subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 2 and 4, eleven subjects. Five subjects achieved 2 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of students.

In order to see whether there is a difference between comprehension component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 4, we look at TABLE 16.

TABLE 16

Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
c4.A (n=15)	3,00	0,40
c4.B (n=15)	2,60	

$t = 0,97$ $p = 0,275$

As TABLE 16 reveals, the mean score of comprehension component results for Text 4 in Group A is 3,00 and 2,60 in Group B. There is a 0,06 difference between the means of the comprehension component in Group A and the comprehension component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 0,97$; $p = 0,275$).

These results show that there is no difference between the comprehension component results for Text 4 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.11 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 4 in Group A is 3, achieved by nine subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by one subject. Five subjects scored 4. The majority of students achieved is 3 (cf. Appendix E).

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 4 in Group B is 2, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by four subjects. Four subjects scored 3 and six subjects scored 4 which constitutes the majority of students (cf. Appendix E).

In order to see whether there is a difference between true/false component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 4, we look at TABLE 17.

TABLE 17

Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf4.A (n=15)	3,47	-0,40
tf4.B (n=15)	3,87	

$t = -1,39$

$p = 0,344$

As TABLE 17 reveals, the mean score of true/false component results for Text 4 in Group A is 3,47 and 3,87 in Group B. There is a -0,40 difference between the means of the true/false component in Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -1,39$; $p = 0,344$).

These results show that there is no difference between the true/false component results for Text 4 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.12 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 4

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 4 in Group A is 0, achieved by six subjects, and the highest score is 2, achieved by one subject. Eight subjects scored 1 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 4 in Group B is 0, achieved by five subjects, and the highest score is 4, achieved by one subject. Three subjects scored between 3 and 1 which also constitutes the majority of subjects (cf. Appendix).

TABLE 18 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 4.

TABLE 20

Comparison of True/False Components Results Group A and Group B for Text 5 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf5.A (n=15)	4,07	-0,06
tf5.B (n=15)	4,13	

$t = -0,18$ $p = 0,178$

As TABLE 20 reveals, the mean score of true/false component results for Text 5 in Group A is 4,07 and 4,13 in Group B. There is a 0,06 difference between the means of the true/false component of Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -0,18$; $p = 0,178$).

These results show that there is no difference between the true/false component results for Text 5 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.15 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 5

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 5 in Group A is 1, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by one subject. The rest of the subjects scored between 2 and 4, achieved by thirteen subjects. Six subjects achieved 4 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 5 in Group B is 2, achieved by two subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by four subjects. Three subjects scored 3 and six subjects scored 4 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

TABLE 21 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 5.

TABLE 22

Comparison of Comprehension Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
c6.A (n=15)	4,20	0,13
c6.7 (n=15)	4,07	

$t = 0,42$ $p = 0,642$

As TABLE 22 reveals, the mean score of comprehension component results for Text 6 in Group A is 4,20 and 4,07 in Group B. There is a 0,13 difference between the means of the comprehension component of Group A and the comprehension component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = 0,42$; $p = 0,642$).

These results show that there is no difference between the comprehension component results for Text 6 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.17 Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 6 in Group A is 3, achieved by three subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by five subjects. Seven subjects scored 4 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

The lowest score for the true/false component for text 6 in Group B is 3, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by eight subjects. Six subjects scored 4. The majority of subjects achieved 5 (cf. Appendix).

In order to see whether there is a difference between true/false component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 6, we look at TABLE 23.

TABLE 23**Comparison of True/False Component Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores**

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf6.A (n=15)	4,13	-0,33
tf6.B (n=15)	4,47	

$t = -1,32$ $p = 0,946$

As TABLE 23 reveals, the mean score of true/false component results for Text 6 in Group A is 4,13 and 4,47 in Group B. There is a -0,33 difference between the means of the true/false component of Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -1,32$; $p = 0,946$).

These results show that there is no difference between the true/false component results for Text 6 in Group A and Group B.

4.2.18 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 6 in Group A is 3, achieved by two subjects, and the highest score is 5, achieved by six subjects. Seven subjects achieved is 4 which also constitutes the majority of subjects (cf. Appendix E).

The lowest score for the guessing vocabulary component for text 6 in Group B is 2, achieved by one subject, and the highest score is 5, achieved by eleven subjects. Three subjects scored 4. The score mainly achieved is 5 (cf. Appendix E) and this constitutes the majority of subjects.

TABLE 24 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary component results in Group A where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and Group B where a short class discussion was used for Text 6.

TABLE 24

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Results between Group A and Group B for Text 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
v6.A (n=15)	4,27	-0,33
v6.B (n=15)	4,60	

$t = -1,19$ $p = 1,000$

As TABLE 24 reveals, the mean score of guessing vocabulary component results for Text 6 in Group A is 4,27 and 4,60 in Group B. There is a -0,33 difference between the means of the true/false component of Group A and the true/false component in Group B. However, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level, ($t = -1,19$; $p = 1,000$).

These results show that there is no difference between the guessing vocabulary component results for Text 6 in Group A and Group B.

4.3 Comparison of Test Results within Groups

In this section, the mean score of texts 1,3,5 will be compared with the mean score of texts 2,4,6 within the two groups.

The mean scores of texts 1,3,5 and texts 2,4,6 for Group A and B were calculated as follows: the total scores of each subject for texts 1,3,5 were added up and divided by the number of subjects which is 45. The total scores of each subject for texts 2,4,6 were added up and divided by the number of subjects which is 45. Therefore, the symbol 'n' in this section represents the number of component points for each text group which is 45.

4.3.1 Test Results within Group A

In this section the mean scores of texts 1,3,5, where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity will be compared with the mean scores of texts 2,4,6, where a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage, within Group A.

TABLE 25 shows whether there is a difference in comprehension when subjects in Group A read a text where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity or when they read texts where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity.

TABLE 25

Test Results within groups for Texts 1,3,5 (listening) and 2,4,6 (speaking) in Group A by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
Text 1,3,5 (n=45)	10,68	1,63
Text 2,4,6 (n=45)	9,06	

$t = 2,98$ $p = 0,005$

The mean score for Texts 1,3,5 is 10,68 and 9,06 for Texts 2,4,6. There is a 1,63 difference between the means. This difference in means is also a statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = 2,98$; $p = 0,005$).

The results given in TABLE 25 reveal that there is a difference between the test results for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6 in Group A. This means that subjects in Group A scored higher in the tests that were given after Texts 1,3,5 where listening for specific information was used in the pre-reading stage than in the tests that were given after texts 2,4,6 where a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage. The results show that subjects in Group A scored higher in the tests given after texts where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity than in the tests given after texts where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity.

4.3.2 Test Results within Group B

In this section the mean scores of texts 1,3,5, where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity will be compared with the mean scores of texts 2,4,6, where listening for specific information was used in the pre-reading stage, within Group B.

In TABLE 26 it can be seen whether there is a difference in comprehension when subjects in Group B read texts where speaking was used as a pre-reading activity or when they read texts where a listening extract was used as a pre-reading activity.

TABLE 26

Test Results within groups for Texts 1,3,5 (speaking) and Texts 2,4,6 (listening) in Group B by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
Text 1,3,5 (n=45)	9,37	-1,60
Text 2,4,6 (n=45)	10,98	

$t = 2,83$ $p = 0,007$

The mean score for Texts 1,3,5 is 9,37 and 10,98 for Texts 2,4,6. There is a 1,60 difference between the means. This difference in means is also a statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = 2,83$; $p = 0,007$).

The above results reveal that there is a difference between the test results for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6 in Group B. Subjects in Group B scored higher in tests given after texts where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity than in tests given after texts where listening for specific information was used .

4.4 Comparison of Test Components within Groups

In the following section the test components comprehension (henceforth c), true/false (henceforth tf), and guessing vocabulary (henceforth v), will be compared within Group A (henceforth A) and Group B (henceforth) for text 1(henceforth 1), for text 2 (henceforth 2), for text 3 (henceforth 3), for text 4 (henceforth 4), for text 5(henceforth 5), for text 6 (henceforth 6).

The mean scores of test components for Group A and B were calculated as follows: The points achieved in the components were added up and divided by the number of component points which is 45 in this case. Therefore, the symbol 'n' in this section represents the number of component points which is 45 for each component group (e.g. c1.A, c3.A, c5.A etc.).

TABLE 28

Comparison of True/False Components within Group A for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf1.A, tf3.A, tf5.A (n=45)	4,07	0,28
tf2.A, tf4.A, tf6.A (n=45)	3,78	

$t = 1,80$ $p = 0,079$

The minimum point subjects in Group A achieved in the true/false components for texts 1,3,5 was 3 and the highest point was 5. The minimum point subjects in Group A achieved in the comprehension components for texts 2,4,6 was 2 and the highest point was 5. The mean score of the comprehension group for texts 1,3,5 is 4,07 and 3,78 for texts 2,4,6. There is a 0,29 difference in the means of the two comprehension component groups. Yet, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = 1,80$; $p = 0,079$).

These results indicate that there is no difference between the true/false component results for texts 1,3,5 where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity and texts 2,4,6 where a short class discussion was used.

4.4.3 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results within Group A for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6

TABLE 29 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary results for Texts 1,3,5 where listening for specific information was used and Texts 2,4,6 where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity.

TABLE 29

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Components within Group A for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
v1.A, v3.A, v5.A (n=45)	3,00	0,97
v2.A, v4.A, v6.A (n=45)	2,02	

$t = 3,07$ $p = 0,004$

The minimum point subjects in Group A achieved in the guessing vocabulary components for texts 1,3,5 was 0 and the highest point was 5. The minimum point subjects in Group A achieved in the guessing vocabulary components for texts 2,4,6 was 0 and the highest point was 5. The mean score of the guessing vocabulary components group for texts 1,3,5 is 3,00 and 2,02 for texts 2,4,6. There is a 0,97 difference in the means of the two guessing vocabulary component groups. This means that, there is also a statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = 3,07$; $p = 0,004$).

It is apparent that there is a difference between the mean scores for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6. Subjects in Group A scored higher in the guessing vocabulary component for Texts 1,3,5 where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity than they did for Texts 2,4,6 where a short class discussion was used.

4.4.4 Comparison of Comprehension Component Results within Group B for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6

TABLE 30 reveals whether there is a difference between comprehension component results for Texts 1,3,5 where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity and texts 2,4,6 where listening for specific information was used.

TABLE 30

Comparison of Comprehension Components within Group B for Texts 1, 3, 5 and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
c1.B, c3.B, c5.B (n=45)	3,79	0,67
c2.B, c4.B, c6.B (n=45)	3,11	

t = 2,99 p = 0,005

The minimum point subjects in Group B achieved in the comprehension components for texts 1,3,5 was 1 and the highest point was 5. The minimum point subjects in Group B achieved in the comprehension components for texts 2,4,6 was 1 and the highest point was 5. The mean score of the comprehension group for texts 1,3,5 is 3,79 and 3,11 for texts 2,4,6. There is a 0,67 difference in the means of the two comprehension component groups. This means that, there is also a statistically significant difference at 0,05 level (t= 2,99; p = 0,005).

The above results indicate that there is a difference between comprehension component results for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6 in Group B. That is, subjects in Group B scored higher in comprehension components for Texts 1,3,5 where a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage than for Texts 2,4,6 where listening for specific information was used.

4.4.5 Comparison of True/False Component Results within Group B for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6

TABLE 31 shows whether there is a difference between true/false component results for Texts 1,3,5 where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity and texts 2,4,6 where listening for specific information was used.

TABLE 31

Comparison of True/False Components within Group B for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
tf1.B, tf3.B, tf5.B (n=45)	4,00	-0,04
tf2.B, tf4.B, tf6.B (n=45)	4,04	

$t = -0,21$ $p = 0,834$

The minimum point subjects in Group B achieved in the true/false components for texts 1,3,5 was 1 and the highest point was 5. The minimum point subjects in Group B achieved in the true/false components for texts 2,4,6 was 2 and the highest point was 5. The mean score of the true/false component group for texts 1,3,5 is 4 and 4,04 for texts 2,4,6. There is a -0,04 difference in the means of the two true/false component groups. Yet, there is no statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = ,021$; $p = 0,834$).

There is no difference between true/false component results for Texts 1,3,5 where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity and Texts 2,4,6 where listening for specific information was used.

4.4.6 Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Component Results within Group B for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6

TABLE 32 shows whether there is a difference between guessing vocabulary results for Texts 1,3,5 where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity and texts 2,4,6 where listening for specific information was used.

TABLE 32

Comparison of Guessing Vocabulary Components within Group B for Texts 1, 3, 5, and Texts 2, 4, 6 by Mean Scores

	Mean	Mean Difference
v1.B, v3.B, v5.B (n=45)	3,20	1,00
v2.B, v4.B, v6.B (n=45)	2,20	

$t = 3,04$ $p = 0,004$

The minimum point subjects in Group B achieved in the guessing vocabulary components for texts 1,3,5 was 0 and the highest point was 5. The minimum point subjects in Group B achieved in the components for texts 2,4,6 was 0 and the highest point was 5. The mean score of the guessing vocabulary component group for texts 1,3,5 is 3,20 and 2,20 for texts 2,4,6. There is a 1,00 difference in the guessing vocabulary means of the two component groups. This means that, there is also a statistically significant difference at 0,05 level ($t = 3,34$; $p = 0,004$).

These results indicate that there is a difference in mean scores between guessing vocabulary results for Texts 1,3,5 and Texts 2,4,6. This means that subjects in Group B scored higher in guessing vocabulary for Texts 1,3,5 where a short class discussion was used as a pre-reading activity than they did for Texts 2,4,6 where listening for specific information was used.

4.5 Summary of Results

When the results are summarized it is noticed that the test results for each group, Group A and Group B, after each reading text reveal no significant difference in comprehension (cf. Chapter 4.2). Whether a listening extract was used as a pre-reading activity or whether a short class discussion was used, both pre-reading activities did not have a significantly different effect on reading comprehension.

When the mean scores of every single component for every test between groups are compared, only a significant difference in the guessing vocabulary component for Text 4 can be seen. As table 18 shows, subjects in Group B scored higher in the guessing vocabulary component for Text 4 where speaking was used in the pre-reading stage than

subjects in Group A where speaking was used. In the comparison of the remaining components between groups, no significant difference is present.

However, when the effect of the two different pre-reading activities was examined within each group, as seen in table 25, it is noticed that subjects in Group A scored higher in the tests given after texts where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity, and as can be seen in Table 26, subjects in Group B scored higher in tests given after texts where a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage.

As results of every single component within each group was taken into consideration, results in table 29 indicate that subjects in Group A scored higher in the guessing vocabulary component for texts in which speaking as a pre-reading activity was used. For the comprehension components component and true/false components in the tests, no difference in means is present, (cf. table 27, 28). However, subjects in Group B scored higher in the comprehension component and guessing vocabulary components for texts with a short class discussion as a pre-reading activity than they did in the comprehension and guessing vocabulary components for texts with listening for specific information as a pre-reading activity, (cf. table 30, 32). For the true/false component in the tests, no significant difference in means is present, (cf. table 31).

4.6 Discussion

The statistical results have demonstrated that there is no difference in comprehension of a reading text when either listening for specific information or a short class discussion is used as a pre-reading activity. Neither the group where listening for specific information was used as a pre-reading activity nor the group where a short class discussion was used scored significantly higher on the comprehension tests.

In the comparison of each component between groups, no difference, except a single difference in the guessing vocabulary component for text 4 which was on the use of pain killers, can be observed. This shows that using listening for specific information or a short class discussion in the pre-reading stage do not have an advantage over the other.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of the Study

Studies on EFL or ESL teaching have agreed on the importance of background knowledge in any skill. One problem that language learners face when learning a language is their inadequate knowledge on the topic to be dealt with. Research has even proved that a lack of background knowledge can also create problems for native language speakers (Grebelsky, 1990). Therefore, a great deal of importance was given to the providing of background knowledge to language learners.

Various ways have been suggested on how to provide background knowledge to language learners. Among these suggested ways are: previews, pretests, short class discussions, visuals, drawing up of lists, eliciting information from students or the setting or answering of questions (oral or written), and listening. The effectiveness of one pre-reading activity over the other has been studied in many ways. However, the use of listening in the pre-reading stage could not go beyond being a suggestion. In one study has listening been used, but with the aim of phonological code recognition prior to a reading activity (Chela-Flores, 1993: 22-27) and only McCarthy (1995) recommends using listening in the pre-reading stage with the aim of building background knowledge.

This research has approached the issue of using listening in building background knowledge in a more specific way "Does listening as a pre-reading activity improve comprehension of a reading text?".

In this study, the effect of using listening in a pre-reading stage on reading comprehension was examined. Two groups of students from the preparatory classes of Education Faculty and Communication Sciences Faculty, Anadolu University were

selected for this study. Prior to the instruction, subjects in the two groups were given the Michigan placement test in order to determine their level of proficiency and 15 students in each group proved to be at the upper-intermediate level of proficiency.

The study was carried out with six reading texts. The reading material to be used was selected from textbooks especially designed for upper-intermediate students, and were all at approximately the same length. They were on topics such as: burglary, sex discrimination, fast food, pain killers, working at home, and earthquakes. The listening extracts related to the reading topics were also selected from textbooks designed for students at the upper-intermediate level. The listening extracts were approximately at the same duration. Discussion questions for the reading texts were designed in such a way that students were expected to give more or less the same information as provided in the listening extracts.

While one text was used with listening for specific information in the pre-reading stage in Group A the same text was used with a short class discussion in the pre-reading stage in Group B. While for the second text a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage in Group A, listening for specific information was used in Group B. This was done in an interchangeable way. Subjects read six reading texts and after each text they had to take a test examining their comprehension of the reading text they had read. Their achievement after each reading text was scored out of 15.

t-test for independent samples was used to compare results between groups. The results revealed no difference in general comprehension between the group where listening was used in the pre-reading stage and the group where speaking was used. A single difference was observed in Group B in the guessing vocabulary from context component for text 4 where a short class discussion was used in the pre-reading stage.

When the results are compared within the groups with the t-test for paired samples, a difference in comprehension was observed. Group A scored higher in tests given after texts where listening was used and Group B scored higher in tests given after texts where a short class discussion was used. In addition, when components are compared within groups, a difference can be seen in the true/false component in Group A, and in the comprehension question and guessing vocabulary component in Group B.

Results indicate that in Group A students scored higher in tests for texts where listening was used as a pre-reading activity.

4. Is there a significant difference in the total scores within Group B in Text 1,3,5 (when a short class discussion is used as a pre-reading activity) and Text 2,4,6 (when a listening extract is used as a pre-reading activity)?

Results indicate that in Group B students scored higher on tests given after texts where speaking was used as a pre-reading activity.

5. Is there a difference in means of each component, which are comprehension questions, true/false questions and guessing vocabulary, within Group A and Group B?

A difference in the true/false component in Group A, and in the comprehension component and guessing vocabulary component in Group B was observed. Group A scored higher in the true/false component for texts where listening was used in the pre-reading stage. Group B scored higher in the comprehension component and guessing vocabulary component for texts where speaking was used.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

This research was carried out with 30 students at the upper-intermediate level between the ages of 17 and 20 in an English as a foreign language environment. The same research might also be carried out with students at different levels of proficiency and in ESP settings. In addition, the number of subjects can also be increased.

In this research, listening for specific information was used in the pre-reading stage, other listening skills could also be used in the pre-reading stage.

The material used were selected from textbooks designed for upper-intermediate students. Authentic material could also be used for this research.

No interest survey was given to students prior to the study. The same research could be carried out with an interest survey prior to the study. In one group texts of interest to students might be used and in the other texts students are not interested can be applied.

Finally, listening could be combined with other skills for building background knowledge or reading could be used as a pre-listening activity.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, Gerry & Peter Wingard : **The Teaching of English as an International Language**, Great Britain: Collins ELT, 1990.
- Afflerbach, Peter D. : "The influence of prior knowledge on expert reader's main idea construction strategies." **Reading Research Quarterly**, Winter, 1990.
- Anderson, Anne & Tony Lynch : **Listening**, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Carrell, Patricia L. & Joan C. Eisterhold : "Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy." **TESOL Quarterly**, vol. 17(4), 1988.
- Chela-Flores, Berta : "Strengthening visual and auditory images in EFL reading: Some listening based techniques." **English Teaching Forum**, Vol: 31(2), 1993.
- Chiang, Chung Shing & Patricia Dunkel : "The effect of speech modification, prior knowledge, and listening proficiency on EFL lecture learning." **TESOL Quarterly**, Vol: 26(2), 1992.

- Clarke, Mark & Sandra Silberstein : "Towards a realization of psycholinguistic principles in the ESL reading class." in Ronald Mackay, Bruce Barman & R. R. Jordan (eds) **Reading in a Second Language**, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1979.
- Coady, James : "A psycholinguistic model of the ESL reader." in Ronald Mackay, Bruce Barman & R. R. Jordan (eds) **Reading in a Second Language**, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1979.
- Dubin, Fraida : "What every teacher should know about reading.", **A Forum Anthology**, 1979-1983, 1982.
- Finger, Alexis : **Tune In Tonight**, USA: Newbury House Publishers, 1985.
- Gebhard, Jerry G. : "Successful comprehension: What teachers can do before students read." **English Teaching Forum**, April, 1987.
- Gower, Roger and Steve Walters : **Teaching Practice Handbook**, England: Heineman, 1983.

- Grebelsky, O. : "What's new in the news?: Comprehension of the news among adults with limited formal education." in Jeanne Shay Schumm "Filling in the gaps: Prior knowledge and the comprehension of news articles." **Journal of Reading**, vol:36 (5), 1993.
- Greenwood, John : "Comprehension and reading." in G. Abbot & P. Wingard (eds) **The Teaching of English as an International Language**, Great Britain: Biddles Ltd., 1990.
- Harmer, Jeremy : **The Practice of English Language Teaching**, Great Britain: Longman, 1991.
- Hartley, James & Ivor K. Davies : "Preinstructional Strategies: the role of pretests, behavioral objectives, overviews and advance organizers." **Review of Educational Research**, Spring, Vol: 42 (2), 1976.
- Heaton, J. B. : **Writing English Language Tests**, New York: Longman, 1991.
- Heaton, J. B. : **Classroom Testing**, New York: Longman: 1990.

- Hughes, Arthur : **Testing for Language Teachers**, Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Jecksembieyva, Nurgaisha : "Pre-reading activities in EFL/ESL reading textbooks and Turkish preparatory school teachers' attitudes towards pre-reading activities." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Bilkent University, 1993.
- Kauffmann, Ruth : "Writing to read and reading to write: teaching literature in the foreign language classroom." **Foreign Language Annals**, Vol: 29(3), 1996.
- Lewis, M. & J. Hill : **Practical Techniques**, England: LTP Teacher Training, 1992.
- Matthews, Alan; M. Spratt and L. Dangerfield : **At the Chalkface**. Avon: The Bath Press, 1988.
- McCarthy, Denise : "Integrated Listening and reading Skills". **TESOL Journal**, Vol. 4(2), 1994/1995.
- McKeating, Douglas : "Comprehension and Listening" in G. Abbot and P. Wingard (eds) **The Teaching of English as an International Language**, London: Collins ELT, 1990.

- Murdoch, George S. : "A more integrated approach to the teaching of reading." **English Teaching Forum**, Jan., 1986.
- Nuttal, Christine : **Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language**, Great Britain: Heineman, 1989.
- Rivers, W. : "The reading skill." cited in Don Byrne **English Teaching Perspectives** Longman Group Limited, 1983.
- Rost, Michael : **Listening in Language Learning**, USA: Longman, 1990.
- Rostedt, Kathleen : **Reading Strategies for University Students**, USA: Collier McMillan, 1988.
- Rudzka, B., J. Channell,
Y. Putseys & P. Ostyn : **More Words You Need**, Hong Kong: MacMillan Publishers, 1991.
- Scarbrough, David : **Reasons for Listening**, Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Scarcella, Robin C. & Rebecca Oxford : **The Tapestry of Language Learning**, USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1992.

- Sivrikaya, Muammer : "An experimental study on the significance of students' interest in reading comprehension through authentic texts." Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Anadolu University, 1996.
- Sonka, Amy L. : "Reading has to be taught too." **A Forum Anthology**, 1979-1983, 1979.
- Taglieber, Loni K., Linda L. Johnson & Donald B. Yarbrough : "Effects of pre-reading activities on EFL reading by Brazilian College students." *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 22(3), 1988
- Vince, Michael : **Highlight - Upper-Intermediate - Student's Book**, Heinemann, 1992.
- Walter, Catherine : **Genuine Articles**, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Williams, Eddie : **Reading in the Language Classroom**, Hong Kong: Modern English Publications, 1991.
- Zukovski/Faust, Jean, Susan S. Johnston & Clarke S. Atkinson : **Between the Lines**, USA: CBS College Publishing, 1983.

APPENDICES**APPENDIX A** 72

Placement Test Scores

APPENDIX B 74

Pre-reading Activities, Reading Texts, Comprehension tests

APPENDIX C 92

Listening Extracts

APPENDIX D 101

Comprehension test results

APPENDIX E 105

Frequency distributions

APPENDIX A

Michigan Placement Scores of Subjects

Group A	Plmt. Scores	Listening Scores	Group B	Plmt. Scores	Listening Scores
Subject			Subject		
1	61	10	1	59	
2	71	16	2	67	16
3	73	12	3	75	15
4	66	13	4	67	12
5	65	14	5	63	14
6	71	11	6	62	11
7	71	15	7	73	12
8	70	12	8	65	11
9	65	13	9	64	13
10	65	13	0	72	15
11	80		11	73	18
12	75	13	12	68	13
13	75	16	13	59	
14	79	12	14	60	
15	75		15	62	13
16	83		16	59	
17	80		17	60	
18	82		18	60	
19	75	17	19	70	13
20	74	18	20	69	11
			21	60	
			22	61	11

APPENDIX B

Pre-reading Activities for Text 1

Pre-reading Activity for Group A

Listen to the extract and answer the following questions.

1. Where did the shop owner get the phone number of the security expert?
2. Which security measures does the expert suggest to the shop owner?
3. Why doesn't the security expert give all the security measures to the shop owner on the phone ?

Pre-reading Activity for Group B

Discussion Questions!

- * How do people try to protect their goods or their home? What security measures do they use?
- * If you were a shop owner what security measures would you use?
- * Which do you think is the most effective security measure?
- * Let's pretend, you are a shop owner and you see a shoplifter stealing something from your shop, what would you do?

Text 1

THE CHAMPION SHOP LIFTER

One morning last week, an attractive dark-haired woman in her thirties walked into a large department store in Glasgow. She wore a bulky coat with hood attached. She carried a large, square parcel in one hand, a shopping bag in the other.

In the outfitting department, the woman admired a row of suits. In a twinkling, she tucked away a £60 tweed suit into a big secret pocket in her coat lining.

In the jewelry department she tried on a pearl necklace. Deftly she slipped it in the hood of her coat.

Next stop, the rainwear counter. She picked up an umbrella, glanced about, coolly tore off the price tag, and walked away with it. After a visit to the electric goods department, the closed umbrella contained a transistor radio, a tape recorder, and four torches.

She then laid her shopping bag on top of a sweater on a nearby counter. When she lifted the bag, the sweater went with her - pulled in through the bag's false bottom. On to the toy department, where she slipped a variety of toys into the 'parcel' she was carrying. The parcel was actually a gift-wrapped empty cardboard box. It had a flap in the side with a spring-device behind it.

Ten more minutes in the store, and the woman also lifted two pairs of slacks, a wig, three cigarette lighters, five wristwatches, and several bottles of perfume. Total haul - more than £200 worth.

The lady with the light fingers is acknowledged as Scotland's champion shoplifter. She steals around £10,000 of goods every year. But everything she steals is returned!

She's a supervisor with Group 4, a security firm that trains and supplies store detectives. Her job is to give new recruits first-hand knowledge of the job. Several times a month she becomes a shoplifter- to let trainees see the dodges shop thieves get up to.

Nobody is more qualified to act the thief than this lady.

She's nabbed more shoplifters in her time than she cares to remember.

The Sunday Post

(Rudzka, B., J. Channell, Y. Putseys. P. Ostyn (1991) More Words You Need. Hong Kong: Macmillan Publishers, 162.)

APPENDIX B (continued)

Pre-reading Activities for Text 2

Pre-reading Activity for Group B

Listen to the extract and answer the following questions.

1. Can the law change the way people think of sex discrimination?

2. What idea is people's discrimination based on?

3. How many of the speakers think that women are not given the same chance as men for applying for a job?

4. Does the woman speaker think that discrimination in language is important?

Pre-reading Activity for Group A

Discussion Questions!

- * What is sex discrimination?

- * In what part of life can we see sex discrimination the most?

- * Why do you think that there is sex discrimination?

- * Do you think that there is sex discrimination in applications for a job?

- * Do men and woman have the same chance of men when they apply for a job?

- * Is there discrimination in Turkish or in English? Can you give any examples?

Text 2

LANGUAGE AND SEX DISCRIMINATION

Language differences often betray discrimination in social relationships. In her book *Male / Female Language*, Mary Ritchie Key describes how label and descriptors can imply unequal status:

A study of the *descriptions* of females who are in public or professional positions provides examples of the actual values put on females in society. The following are illustrations I have collected from magazines and newspapers. The women described are not women who won the lottery, but are women who have positions entailing a good deal of training and expertise. The women were variously described as: 'a serene, delicately formed women' (referring to an executive chairperson); 'a brown-eyed cutie' (referring to an athlete); '(she) speaks softly ... blushes and laughs...' (referring to a commanding officer); 'a very feminine women' (referring to a chief of a Flight Service Station). A Pilot was headlined as 'Women flier...' A member of a commission was designated a 'mother'. A book which received considerable attention was written by a 'housewife with an Oxford degree in English'. Apparently an attempt is being made to assure women they can still remain sexually attractive even if professionally competent.

Unreal and cruel dichotomizing in language behavior inevitably leads to double standards in the treatment of male and female in every aspect of language use.

Job titles and classification are different depending upon whether male or female fills the position. A male is an 'assistant manager'; a female is an 'administrative assistant'. A female professor will be 'Mrs. Doe' while her husband (on the same campus!) is 'Prof. Doe'. Description of male and female have a different ring to them: an older woman has 'wrinkles' but an older man has 'deep crevices'.

The matter of description of people and the interpretation of human qualities is based for instance on this double standard. A bold man is 'courageous' but a bold woman is 'aggressive'. A student pointed out to me that one can say of a woman who is easy to seduce, 'She's easy' but one cannot say 'He's easy'. A person who is innovative is pushy if female, but 'original' if male. If insisted, a female is 'hysterical' but a male is 'persistent'. If politically involved, a female is 'over-emotional', a male is 'committed'.

Mary Ritchie Key, *Male/Female Language*

(Rudzka, B., J. Channell, Y. Putseys, P. Ostyn (1991) More Words You Need. Hong Kong: Macmillan Publishers, 109.)

Answer the following comprehension questions.

1. What aspects of language can show sex discrimination?
2. What are female pilots called?
3. According to the writer, what are the labels used to assure women of?
4. Give one example of labels in jobs that differ according to male and female mentioned in the text.
5. Labeling males and females creates a double standard. What is based on this double standard?

Are the following statements True (T) or False (F)?

1. Labels can show unequal status. T / F
2. The women the writer has chosen as examples were not chosen specifically. T / F
3. A woman who writes a book is labeled as a writer. T / F
4. Men and women do not have the same titles for the same jobs. T / F
5. There is no difference in the choice of words when describing a man or a woman. T / F

Find words from the text with the same meaning as the following:

1. (Paragraph 1) require; make necessary:
2. (Paragraph 1) quite a lot:
3. (Paragraph 1) successful:
4. (Paragraph 2) to result in:
5. (Paragraph 4) interested in new ideas:

APPENDIX B (continued)**Pre-reading Activities for Text 3****Pre-reading Activity for Group A**

Listen to the extract and answer the following questions!

- 1) What are the bad components in fast food?
- 2) Which of the following good components in fast food are mentioned by the speaker?

(Put a tick.)

protein ____ calcium ____ iron ____ phosphor ____ zinc ____

- 3) Give two examples of fast food that is good for you!

Pre-reading Activity for Group B**Discussion Questions!**

- * How many of you enjoy eating?
- * What is your favorite food?
- * What are the good components in food?
- * What are the bad components in food?
- * Do you like fast food? What do you like?
- * Do you think that fast food is healthy?

Text 3

EAT WELL BUT WISELY

The typical American diet is rich in egg yolks, fatty meats, butter and cream. These are the main sources of cholesterol and animal (saturated) fats. These foods tend to raise the level of cholesterol in the blood, which contributes to the development of atherosclerosis.

Atherosclerosis is a condition in which fatty deposits form on the inner walls of the arteries and interfere with the free flow of blood. Atherosclerosis is the root cause of most heart attacks and strokes.

Most people with a high blood cholesterol level can reduce this risk of heart attack by following a diet designed to control their blood cholesterol levels.

Other ways of reducing the risk of heart attack include maintaining ones proper weight, exercising regularly, getting proper medical treatment for high blood pressure or diabetes, and not smoking cigarettes.

* * *

CONTROL YOUR INTAKE OF CHOLESTEROL-RICH FOODS

Don't eat more than two eggs a week, including those used in cooking, and limit your consumption of shrimp, lobster and organ meats.

CONTROL THE AMOUNT AND TYPE OF FAT YOU EAT

Don't eat more than five-seven ounces of lean meat, fish, or poultry each day. Substitute vegetable proteins for animal proteins often. For example, one cup of vegetable proteins such as dried beans, peas, or legumes has about as much protein as two-three ounces of cooked meat, but contains only a trace of fat. Fish, poultry, and veal are low in saturated fat, so eat them more often than beef, lamb or pork.

Choose lean cuts of meat, trim visible fat, and discard the fat that cooks out of the meat.

Avoid frying food; use cooking methods that help remove such fat as baking, boiling, broiling, roasting or stewing.

Restrict your consumption of fatty "luncheon" and "variety" meats like sausages and salami.

Use liquid vegetable oils and margarine rich in polyunsaturated fats instead of butter or other solid cooking fats that are primarily hydrogenated. Select margarine that have liquid vegetable oils such as corn, cottonseed, or some flower oil listed as their first ingredient.

Use skimmed or low-fat milk and cheeses made from partially skimmed milk instead of whole milk and cheeses made from whole milk and cream.

Adapted from Eat Well But Wisely
© American Heart Association.

(Rostedt, Kathleen and Julia Tevis McGory (1988) Strategies for University Students. USA: Collier Mcmillan, 24)

Answer the following comprehension questions:

1. Give two examples of food that raise the cholesterol level!
2. What are the suggested ways in which people can reduce their risk of a heart attack?
 - a. _____ d. _____
 - b. _____ e. _____
 - c. _____
3. What should you do with fat on meat?
4. How can you remove fat in food? (give one example)
5. What should you use instead of whole milk?

Are the following statements True (T) or False (F)?

1. Artherosclerosis is formed by fat getting together on the outside parts of your arteries.
T / F
2. The possibility of people with high blood pressure to have a heart attack is high. T / F
3. You shouldn't eat eggs to reduce your risk of heart attack. T / F
4. There is as much protein in dried beans as in meat. T / F
5. Sausages are not bad for your health. T / F

What do the following words in the text mean? Give a definition for each word!

1. (Paragraph 1) contribute:
2. (Paragraph 2) root:
3. (Paragraph 4) maintain:
4. (Paragraph 6) substitute:
5. (Paragraph 7) trim:

APPENDIX B (continued)

Pre-reading Activities for Text 4

Pre-reading Activity for Group B

Listen to the extract and answer the following questions!

1. What do you need to buy Zomax?
2. Why is Johnson and Johnson taking Zomax completely off the market?
3. Why did Doctor Jack Jaffa lose control while driving?

Pre-reading Activity for Group A

Discussion Questions!

- * What do you do when you have a headache or any kind of pain?
- * What is the best way to relieve your pain?
- * How often do you take painkillers and which painkillers do you take?
- * What sort of side effects do pain killers usually have?
- * Do you think that people read the warning labels on the medicine? Why/why not?
- * What should be done if a medicine has serious and very serious and harmful side effects?

Text 4

The Morbid Society

A favorite device¹ of novelist who think the world is sick is to picture modern society as one vast hospital ward². To social critic Ivan Illich, this image is literally true. Illich thinks that from prenatal probes to postmortem examinations, modern medicine has turned the citizen of advanced and industrial nations into lifelong patients who are presumed sick until proven healthy. The paradoxical result, Illich argues in his brilliant new book "Medical Nemesis"³ is an epidemic of multiple 'iatrogenesis' the ancient Greek term for physician-induced illness.

Illich's primary concern is not with the pain, sickness and death caused directly by doctors, hospitals and the indiscriminate use of drugs. These forms of malpractice are, in his radical diagnosis, merely the overt clinical manifestations of the more serious, pervasive 'medicalization of life', which makes whole populations morbidly⁴ dependent upon a dubious - and expensive system - of medical care. Like other critics, Illich insists that better housing and other environmental factors have done more than institutionalized medicine to improve health. He also reminds us that major diseases such as tuberculosis declined before physicians intervened with antibiotics.

According to Illich, the expansion of medicine into a multibillion-dollar industry becomes counter-productive⁵. Medical bureaucracy, he says, creates bad healthy by generating painful new needs (drug dependence and unnecessary surgery), by lowering the levels of tolerance for discomfort or pain, and 'by abolishing even the ring to self-care'. In sum, Illich finds, modern medicine has produced 'a morbid society that demands universal medicalization and a medical establishment that certifies universal morbidity'.

Although he would retain many fruitful methods of modern medicine, including certain forms of inoculation⁶ and limited reliance⁷ on experts, he believes that the most important health services can be performed by the people themselves. Medicalized civilization, he argues, is organized 'to kill pain, to eliminate sickness and to abolish the need for an art of suffering and of dying'. By contrast, traditional cultures confront pain, suffering and death as tests of the arts of living goads⁸ for producing compassion, patience and the dignified acceptance of death. The ultimate nemesis³ produced by modern medicine, Illich warns, is the gradual loss of these traditional human virtues.

Glossary:

1. technique
2. section of a hospital
3. goddess of revenge; revenge
4. in an unhealthy way
5. producing the opposite of what it aims at
6. preventive injection of germs in small quantities to cause the body to build up prevention to a disease
7. trust
8. motivation

(Rudzka, B., J. Channell, Y. Putseys, P. Ostyn (1991) More Words You Need, p: 109. Hong Kong: Macmillan Publishers.)

Answer the following comprehension questions:

1. What does Ivan Illich call citizens of advanced and industrial nations?
2. According to Illich, what are the causes of pain, sickness, and death?
3. What does Illich compare medicine to?
4. According to Illich, what is the best health service?
5. What is a result of modern medicine?

Are the following statements True (T) or False (F)?

1. Ivan Illich doesn't agree with novelists who think that the world is sick. T / F
2. Ivan Illich's book is not about the goddess "Nemesis". T / F
3. According to Illich, better housing and environmental factors improve health. T / F
4. Illich believes that modern medicine is good. T / F
5. medicalized civilizations and traditional cultures, have the same ideas about pain.
T / F

Find words from the text with the same meaning as the following:

1. (Paragraph 1) illustrate; imagine:
2. (Paragraph 1) believe; suppose:
3. (Paragraph 2) decrease:
4. (Paragraph 3) produce; form:
5. (Paragraph 4) slow:

APPENDIX B (continued)**Pre-reading Activities for Text 5****Pre-reading Activity for Group A**

Listen to the extract and answer the following questions!

1. What three things do you need to work at home?

- a.
- b.
- c.

2. List two advantages of working at home!

- a.
- b.

3. List two disadvantages of working at home!

- a.
- b.

Pre-reading Activity for Group B**Discussion Questions!**

- * Do you know anybody who works at home?
- * What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of working at home?
- * What are the advantages and disadvantages of working outside?
- * What do you need in order to work at home?
- * Which one would you prefer? Working at home or working outside the home?

Text 5

HOW TO SHINE AT A JOB INTERVIEW

The smart job-seeker needs to get rid of several standard myths about interviewing before starting to pound the pavement looking for a job. What follows is a list of some of these untruths and some tips to help you do your best at your next interview.

Myth 1: The aim of interviewing is to obtain a job offer

Only half true. The real aim of an interview is to obtain the job you *want*. That often means rejecting job offers you don't want! Incompetent job-seekers, however, become so used to accommodating employers' expectations that they often easily qualify for jobs they don't want. So, before you do back-flips for an employer, be sure you want the job.

Myth 2: Always please the interviewer

Not true. try to please yourself. Giving answers that you think will suit a potential employer, losing touch with your own feelings (in order to get in touch with some other person's feelings) and, in general, practicing an abject policy of appeasement are certain to get you nowhere. Of course, don't be hostile - nobody wants to hire someone disagreeable. But there is plainly a middle ground between being too ingratiating and being hostile. An effective interview (whether you are offered the job or not) is like an exciting encounter in conversation with your seatmate on an airplane.

Myth 3: Try to control the interview

Nobody "controls" an interview - neither you nor the interviewer - although one or both parties often try. Then it becomes a phony exchange between two human beings; no business is likely to be transacted. When somebody tries to control us, we resent it. When we try to control somebody, they resent us. Remember, you can't control what employers think of you, just as they can't control what you think of them. So hang loose when interviewing: Never dominate the interview. Compulsive behaviour turns off your authenticity.

Myth 4: Never interrupt the interviewer

No dice. "Never talk when I'm interrupting," said McGeorge Bundy.

Good advice.

Study the style of effective conversationalists: They interrupt and are interrupted! An exciting conversation always makes us free - free to interrupt, to disagree, to agree enthusiastically. We feel comfortable with people who allow us to be natural. So, when interviewing, half the responsibility lies with you. Do you seem uptight? Try being yourself for a change. Employers will either like or dislike you, but at least you'll have made an *impression*. Leaving an employer indifferent is the worst impression you can make. And the way to make an effective impression is to feel free to be yourself., which frees the interviewers to be *themselves*!

Myth 5: Don't disagree with the interviewer

Another silly myth. If you don't disagree at times, you become, in effect, a "yes" man or woman. Don't be afraid to disagree with your interviewer - in an agreeable way.

The worst that could happen would be that the interviewer thinks, "There's a person with an open mind!" The conventional wisdom says "be yourself," true enough. But how many people can be themselves if they don't feel free to disagree?

(Walter, Catherine (1990) Genuine Articles. p: 2-3. Cambridge University Press)

Answer the following comprehension questions:

1. What should a job-seeker do before s/he starts looking for a job?
2. With what does the writer compare the interview?
3. What does the writer say about controlling the interview?
4. What do you do in an effective conversation?
5. What are people who always agree called?

Are the following statements True (T) or False (F)?

1. All the myths about interviews are true. T / F
2. It is important to get the job you want. T / F
3. If you control the interview you can also control what the interviewer thinks of you.
T / F
4. If you feel to be yourself, your interviewer doesn't feel to be himself. T / F
5. If you feel free to disagree, you can be yourself. T / F

Find words from the text with the same meaning as the following:

1. (Paragraph 1) clever:
2. (Paragraph 2) refuse:
3. (Paragraph 3) disagreeable:
4. (Paragraph 4) to feel angry:
5. (Paragraph 5) nervous:

APPENDIX B (continued)

Pre-reading Activities for Text 6

Pre-reading Activity for Group B

Listen to the extract and answer the following questions!

1. What has been estimated to be at 30 million dollars?
2. How long did it take the earthquake to start destroying downtown Colinga?
3. What is beginning in July?

Pre-reading Activity for Group A

Discussion Questions!

- * Have you ever seen an earthquake?
- * In which part of our country can you see earthquakes the most?
- * In which part of the world can you see earthquakes the most?
- * How long do you think it would take an earthquake to destroy a city?
- * If there were an earthquake in Istanbul, how much TL would the damage be?
- * What is done after an earthquake destroys a city? Think of Afyon - Dinar!

Text 6

JAPAN PREPARES FOR EARTHQUAKES

Japan is perhaps the most seismically active country in the world with over 10,000 earthquakes hitting each day. Of these 10,000, one thousand are strong enough for people to feel. Recently, Tokyo was hit by two earthquakes registering over 6 on the Richter scale two nights in a row. Japan expects even larger earthquakes in the future, so the Japanese government, scientists, and people are making numerous preparations.

The earthquake that is expected in the future will register 8 on the Richter scale, hundred times greater than a six. The 1980 quake in Algeria was 7.5 on the Richter scale and devastated the country, killing over 200,000 people. The residents of Tokyo remember the earthquake of 1923, which killed 100,000 Japanese. These instances of the devastation an earthquake can cause are foremost in the Japanese peoples' minds and are the reasons for their extensive preparations.

More than any other earthquake-prone country, Japan is prepared for a strong earthquake. For example, the Japanese government spends as much on earthquake preparations as it does on national defense. The city of Tokyo is destroying thousands of wooden homes and replacing them with concrete structures. The city hopes this will help eliminate destruction by fire after a major earthquake. Furthermore, the city is storing food, blankets, baby bottles, and 400,000 tons of water in preparation for the expected quake. The water (stored in earthquake-proof storage houses) is sufficient for all 12 million Tokyo residents for 10 days.

Many other examples show the degree to which the Japanese are prepared. the famous "bullet trains" traveling up to 130 m.p.h. between cities, have special "earthquake brakes". These breaks engage automatically in the event of an earthquake. In addition, every September 1, the anniversary of the 1923 quake, the Japanese practice earthquake drills. Also, most Japanese households are equipped with earthquake kits - containers with food, water, flashlights, fire extinguishers.

Japanese scientists have the world's most extensive earthquake prediction system. There are sophisticated machines at 70 different places that continually read the Earth's gravity, magnetism, tilt, and crust changes. All these machines transmit, or send, the data to computers at the Tokyo headquarters of the Japan Meteorological Agency, the nation's weather bureau. Scientists take measurement of the above sea level, the rise and fall of groundwater and other phenomena. The city of Tokyo is even recording the activities of 6 catfish on a computer. It is believed that catfish act differently when an earthquake is coming.

In spite of these numerous preparations, there is still some question about being able to predict earthquakes. However, it is hoped that a large earthquake will be predictable. "If it is an earthquake of more than 8 on the Richter Scale," says Hirotosugo Shibata, head of the National Land Agencies disaster-prevention department, "we can predict it."

Answer the following comprehension questions:

1. After which event did the Japanese begin preparing for earthquakes?
2. Why is the city of Tokyo building concrete structures?
3. List two examples in which the Japanese are prepared for earthquakes.
 - a.
 - b.
4. A computer in Tokyo is reporting something unusual. What is it?
5. What kind of an earthquake can the Japanese definitely predict?

Are the following statements True (T) or False (F)?

1. The Japanese can feel all earthquakes that hit Japan each year. T / F
2. Japan is better prepared for an earthquake than other earthquake-prone countries.
T / F
3. The Japanese have already started preparing for an earthquake. T / F
4. Earthquakes are as important to Japanese as national defense. T / F
5. Catfish are said to feel an earthquake. T / F

Find words from the text with the same meaning as the following:

1. (Paragraph 1) many; a lot:
2. (Paragraph 2) to destroy:
3. (Paragraph 3) enough:
4. (Paragraph 4) to work:
5. (Paragraph 5) large:

APPENDIX C

Listening Extracts used in the Pre-reading Stage

Listening extract for Text 1

(Security Expert henceforth S.E., Norman Murray henceforth N.M.)

S.E. :Hello!

N.M.:Hello! Is that Security Guard Limited?

S.E. :Yes. How can I help you?

N.M.:My name is Murray, Norman Murray. The local police gave me your number. I'm interested in shop security. I'm just opening a clothes shop and I want to cut down on shop lifting. Can you give me some ideas of what kinds of security you have available or....perhaps... you can send someone around to talk to me.

S.E. :We can certainly send someone around but I can also give you some idea of our staff training programs... then you can think over your requirements before we meet to discuss the details.

N.M.:Yes, perhaps you can do that... er... I've got some idea of course but I'm concerned about possible losses. It's not so much staff training I'm interested in, It is actual equipment. What do you recommend?

S.E. :Well...cameras of course which give you display of all the corners of the shop so the whole area can be watched from the screen. And ... hmm...you did say it was a clothes shop, didn't you?

N.M.:Yes. Men's clothes actually.

S.E. :You probably know that in the clothes, you can easily install a small magnetic tag which must be removed before the article leaves the shop. So that's anyone stealing clothes and not removing the tag sets off an alarm in the doorway. The tags are quite easily to bit but rather difficult to remove unless you have the right equipment.

N.M.:Ahh! I'd like details of that one, I think that sound like a good idea!

S.E. :We also recommend that the lighting in the shop is as good as possible. For obvious reasons. It's much easier to steal if no one can see you... and ...mirrors are also very effective... if you decide against the camera system. Though, some shops do fit both cameras and mirrors... we do have some other systems available too but I am not allowed to discuss them over the phone for security reasons.

N.M.:I see. Well, perhaps you could send someone around to the shop.

S.E. :Yes, of course, that should be easy to arrange. Perhaps you could first of all give me your name and address.

(Vince, 1992, Highlight - Upper-Intermediate. Heinemann.)

APPENDIX C (continued)

Listening extract for Text 2

Sex discrimination

- Jan: Changes are very gradual. They're too slow. I mean if you sit under a tree long enough the apple'll fall off and you can eat it but sometimes you've got to stand up and do something. You've got to . . . Um I think the law is there to protect people. Because women were being discriminated against, it was necessary for the law to stop that, um at least to some extent. But you can't change the way people think.
- Duncan: People's discrimination is based on the fact . . . a lot of it, that they don't think women are capable of making decisions or have any intelligence at all. I mean a lot of people believe that . . . and if that . . . provided . . . once that's proved wrong, that removes the valid grounds for the discrimination and you know you . . . the belief is then unjustified. You've got to stamp it out. I mean, it's as simple as that.
- Keith: But just in the same way that if I want to become a managing director, I have to look at the company in which I work and prove certain elements of my behaviour or . . . or my skills to these people, so must women.
- Jan: Yes, but if they're not given the chance, then how can they? I mean it's very sad that the law has to be there at all. I mean that you have to say to somebody who's employing someone you must give . . . you must interview men and women . . . it seems a great shame . . . you have to tell people to do that. It's also a great shame that you have to tell people not to go around murdering other people. I mean, the law's there because people do stupid things.
- Duncan: As I say, the law is . . . is not that you have to sort of . . . I mean you basically all you have to do is give women the right to apply and the right to be considered in the same way as everybody else and if the law was effective as it should be, there'd be nothing wrong with that. I mean, what's wrong with giving women the chance to apply for a job and giving them the right to be considered on equal terms with men.
- Keith: Women could always . . . women could always apply.
- Duncan: That's not true, though. I mean there are employers who just would not consider them.
- David: A woman would not apply if the job was . . . if the job advertisement was couched in such terms.
- Keith: I mean . . . the leading example . . .
- Duncan: I mean the whole point about the . . . an advertisement asking for a draughtsman being against the terms of the act, is that it gives the imp . . . it's implied that only men will be considered and that's why that would be a legal advertisement if you put at the bottom, um applications from men and women will be considered . . . the same with postmen and all the other jobs.
- David: Interesting point. How important is the language, Jan, do you think?
- Jan: I . . . it's symbolic. Um I personally don't find it particularly important. Er if you have a meeting and you call the man or the woman who chairs the meeting the chairman, it just doesn't matter I don't think at all.

(Scarborough, 1984, *Reasons for Listening*. Cambridge University Press.)

APPENDIX C (continued)**Listening extract for Text 3**

(Narrator henceforth N. and Food Expert henceforth F.E.)

N. : Hello and welcome to food and you! Our weekly program about what we eat and what we shouldn't eat. And this week we're taking a look at so-called 'fast food'. It's the kind of food that people argue about quite a lot when they are not eating that is. Some people love it and the manufacturers of course are always telling us how good it is. But there have been some disturbing reports lately in the newspapers suggesting that it's not only fairly fattening, which I think we all knew, but that hamburgers, for example, are not always made from good quality meat. Is fast food then just a fast way to get fat or is it as good as people say. We asked our nutritionist, Pamela Green to tell us all about it.

F.E.: Well, Gavin, the first thing I have to say is that there is a lot of it. In the U.K., for example, there are nearly 750,000 places that sell fast food and that's not including fish and chips shops. It's true I'm afraid that there is a lot of fattening fast food such as, hamburgers, pizzas and so on. The government actually recommends that out of your total daily amount of calories, which is probably about 2250 for most of us, the amount of fat everyday should be no more than 35% of these calories. If you eat chicken and chips, you're actually getting about 50 grams of fat, and with fish and chips the figure is only slightly lower... about 47 grams. Even pizza is about 40 grams of fat in a portion. So, any of these food is giving you a whole day's supply of fat I'm afraid. Not only this, but there is also a lot of in fast food Gavin, and that isn't good for you. The World Health Organization recommends no more than 5 grams of salt a day... that's about a teaspoon full. But hamburgers, for example, contain about 4 grams of salt, which is a lot.

N. : Well, back on the diet for me then. But I also asked Pam if fast food has anything good to offer.

F.E.: Oh, yes, Gavin ... a lot actually. Fish and chips, for example, are rich in vitamins B₁ and C, iron, zinc, protein and calcium, all jollyous for us all. Chicken and chips ... well ... lots of protein, calciun and vitamins B₂, B₆, and calcium. So you can see that there is quite a lot of value in these foods. And hamburger has vitamin B₁₂ as well as protein, iron, calcium and zinc.

N. : What bout other popular foods such as jacked potatoes or milkshakes?

F.E.: Oh! Jacked potatoes are very good actually. You've got iron, zinc, vitamin B₁₂, B₂ and vitamin C. Milk is always good for you and a milkshake contains protein, calcium and vitamins A, B₂ and B₁₂. Oh, not to forget pizza, of course. I'm afraid I eat rather a lot of that myself. That's got vitamin C, A, B₂ and E. Well ... that's a cheese and tomatoe pizza as well as protein and calcium of course.

N. : Well, thank you Pam. I now feel a lot more hungry but a bit less guilty.....

(Vince, 1992, Highlight - Upper-Intermediate. Heinemann.)

APPENDIX C (continued)

Listening extract for Text 4

ZOMAX: A PAIN-KILLING DRUG — MARCH 4, 1983

- Frank Reynolds:** Zomax. It's a pain-killing *drug* not sold *over the counter*. It can be *purchased* only with a doctor's *prescription*. But today the *manufacturer*, Johnson & Johnson, announced it is taking Zomax completely *off the market*, because at least five deaths have been *linked* to the drug. People who have it in their homes were asked to return it to their doctor or to the company. George Strait has more on the story.
- George Strait:** Last December, Dr. Jack Jaffa lost control of his car after suddenly going into *convulsions* and *passing out*. After the accident, tests revealed Dr. Jaffa had had an *allergic reaction* to the pain killer he had been taking—Zomax.
- Dr. Jaffa:** The first thing I remember was waking up in the *ambulance* approximately twenty minutes after the accident, ah, and hearing them say that I had no *pulse* and no *blood pressure*.
- George Strait:** In the two and a half years Zomax has been on the market, there have been more than a thousand such reactions and five deaths, four in the last five weeks. Zomax has been recommended as an effective *nonnarcotic* all-purpose pain killer. More than fifteen million prescriptions have been written. Labels do warn of possible allergic reactions, but officials of the *Food and Drug Administration* which approved those *labels* conceded the warnings are not strong enough.
- Food and Drug Administration Official:** People don't ah . . . read the ah . . . labeling as well, as well as they should, but there's no question. . . .
- George Strait:** That's doctors and patients.
- Food and Drug Administration Official:** Right. Well, in this case, it's doctors.
- George Strait:** In the next three weeks the *FDA* will issue new stronger labels warning Zomax should not be taken by *aspirin-sensitive* people and should only be used to treat extreme *unremitting* pain, not headaches, toothaches, or *menstrual cramps*. In withdrawing its pain killer from the market, Johnson & Johnson said Zomax is safe for the vast majority of patients. A spokesman said the drug company took the action as a *precaution*. Meanwhile, FDA officials suggest that people with Zomax on their medicine shelves should check with their doctors before taking another tablet. George Strait, ABC News, Washington.

APPENDIX C (continued)

Listening extract for Text 5

(John henceforth J. and Martin henceforth M.)

J. : And if you've had enough of travelling to work everyday... and I know I've had ... this might be just the news for you. Martin Low has been reading about how it is time we all just stayed at home instead of commuting to the office. I must say, that sounds an interesting idea. Martin, hello!

M. : Hi!

J. : What have you found out?

M. : Well, John. It does sound good, doesn't it? And it's already started to happen. The experts call it tele-commuting which sounds very technical but all it means is that with modern technology such as the answering machine, the fax machine and the computer, you can just work at home and your company can easily keep in touch with you. It's as simple as that.

J. : Hmm ... this kind of thing sounds perfect but is really a good idea? Yeah, there must be some disadvantages as well as advantages.

M. : Well, it's said it is easy to do as long as you have a phone of course. And it really could change the way we all live. The first obvious benefit is that everyone saves time, instead of sitting on the train, as I do everyday, you just walk into your spare room. You can also work in any part of the country you like. It doesn't matter how far away you are from the actual offices of the company. And there are ways in which this change might help with the problem of unemployment. For example, in some parts of the country, it is difficult to find work and if you can't move to ... say ... London ... then you're unemployed. But this way, it is easy to find a job in London without actually going there. This kind of thing is quite common in the United States.

J. : Yeah, it sounds like a good idea but wouldn't you miss the old office routine Martin? I mean, people do more than just work in their offices, don't they?

APPENDIX C (continued)

Listening extract for Text 6

EARTHQUAKE IN CALIFORNIA — JUNE 6, 1983

- Max Robinson:** Farther west in Coalinga, California, **damage** has been **estimated** at 30 million dollars from the **earthquake** which **devastated** the little town five weeks ago. However, Steven Gear reports that **toll** will eventually go a lot higher.
- Steven Gear:** It took the **earthquake** about twenty seconds to begin the job of **destroying** most of downtown Coalinga. The **bulldozers** are expected to finish the job nine weeks from now, at a cost of two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars. Fifty-four **structures** will go, so that a redevelopment project can begin in July. This building looking like a giant **doll house** with its interior exposed is typical of the **unreinforced masonry** buildings that were so heavily damaged in the quake. It was built about sixty years ago before earthquake safety standards went into effect. Five newer **downtown** buildings will remain; their **construction** served them well during the 6.5 quake. . . . This mess was a **grocery** operated by Vince Mott's family for sixty-two years. He's going to rebuild at a cost of half a million dollars.
- Vince Mott:** The town's gonna come back. There's no getting around it. It's happened this way before. It burnt down once and . . . it's always came back.
- Steven Gear:** In the **residential** areas of the city of seven thousand, the damage is much less visible, but more than three hundred homes were **destroyed** and more than nineteen hundred damaged. **Trailers** have been brought in to provide homes for the homeless and there are still small tent cities. Lee Bishop's home is **condemned**, and for a month, she and her daughter, their **parakeet**, and their dog have been living in a **tent**. She has no plans to leave Coalinga.
- Lee Bishop:** It's my home. I've been here eleven years. Where would I go? The whole state of California is earthquake **prone**. So, where are you going to run to?
- Steven Gear:** For a few residents, new home construction is already underway.
Steven Gear, ABC News, Coalinga.

APPENDIX D

Comprehension Test Results

Scores Obtained by Subjects and their Means

Text 1	Text 2
--------	--------

Group A	C 1.8	tf 1.8	V 1.8	Mean	C 2.8	tf 2.8	V 2.8	Mean
1	2,75	5	4	11,75	1	2	0	3,00
2	3,00	4	4	11,00	1	5	1	7,00
3	4,75	5	4	13,75	3,5	4	2	9,50
4	4,75	4	4	12,75	2	4	2	8,00
5	5,00	4	4	13,00	1	2	1	4,00
6	4,00	3	4	11,00	4	3	2	9,00
7	3,50	4	4	11,50	3	3	0	6,00
8	3,50	4	4	11,50	3	4	1	8,00
9	3,75	5	4	12,75	3	5	3	11,00
10	4,00	4	4	12,00	2	4	1	7,00
11	3,75	4	4	11,75	4	5	0	9,00
12	3,00	3	4	10,00	2	4	1	7,00
13	1,75	3	5	9,75	3	4	0	7,00
14	4,00	5	4	13,00	3	3	1	7,00
15	3,75	4	4	11,75	3	4	2	9,00
Group B	C 1.7	tf 1.7	V 1.7	Mean	C 2.7	tf 2.7	V 2.7	Mean
1	5	5	4	14,00	2	4	1	7,00
2	4	5	5	14,00	2	3	1	6,00
3	5	4	5	14,00	3	5	0	8,00
4	4	5	4	13,00	2	4	0	6,00
5	4	4	4	12,00	4	5	2	11,00
6	5	4	4	13,00	3	5	1	9,00
7	4,75	3	4	11,75	2	3	1	6,00
8	4,50	3	4	11,50	2	3	2	7,00
9	5	4	5	14,00	4	3	1	8,00
10	4	4	4	12,00	5	4	0	9,00
11	4	5	4	13,00	2	4	0	6,00
12	3,75	2	3	8,75	3	4	1	8,00
13	4	5	4	13,00	1	2	0	3,00
14	4	3	4	11,00	3	4	0	7,00
15	5	3	4	12,00	2	4	1	7,00

APPENDIX D (continued)

Text 3	Text 4
--------	--------

Group A	C 3.8	tf 3.8	V 3.8	Mean	C 4.8	tf 4.8	V 4.8	Mean
1	3,6	4	1	8,60	4	3	1	8,00
2	2,5	1	1	4,50	4	3	2	9,00
3	3,8	4	1	8,80	1	4	0	5,00
4	4,0	4	3	11,00	3	3	0	6,00
5	5,0	3	3	11,00	3	3	0	6,00
6	2,8	4	2	8,80	2	3	0	5,00
7	5,0	4	0	9,00	3	3	1	7,00
8	4,0	5	1	10,00	4	4	1	9,00
9	3,0	4	3	10,00	3	4	0	7,00
10	3,0	2	1	6,00	4	3	1	8,00
11	5,0	5	3	13,00	2	4	0	6,00
12	5,0	5	1	11,00	2	3	1	6,00
13	3,0	4	3	10,00	2	4	1	7,00
14	4,0	5	3	12,00	4	3	1	8,00
15	3,0	4	0	7,00	4	5	1	10,00
Group B	C 3.7	tf 3.7	V 3.7	Mean	C4.7	tf 4.7	V 4.7	Mean
1	3,0	5	1	9,00	1	4	0	5,00
2	4,0	5	2	11,00	4	3	0	7,00
3	3,0	5	1	9,00	2	2	1	5,00
4	3,0	2	2	7,00	2	4	3	9,00
5	2,8	5	2	9,80	3	4	4	11,00
6	4,0	3	4	11,00	4	5	3	12,00
7	3,6	4	2	9,60	2	5	0	7,00
8	3,8	5	0	8,80	3	4	0	7,00
9	5,0	4	5	14,00	1	5	1	7,00
10	4,0	3	3	10,00	5	5	3	13,00
11	3,6	4	1	8,60	1	3	1	5,00
12	4,0	4	0	8,00	3	3	1	7,00
13	2,6	4	0	6,60	2	4	1	7,00
14	4,0	2	2	8,00	2	3	0	6,00
15	5,0	4	0	9,00	4	4	1	9,00

APPENDIX D (continued)

Text 5	Text 6
--------	--------

Group A	C 5.8	tf 5.8	V 5.8	Mean	C 6.8	tf 6.8	V 6.8	Mean
1	3	3	3	9,00	4,0	4	4	12,00
2	3	4	3	10,00	3,0	5	4	12,00
3	3	3	3	9,00	5,0	4	5	14,00
4	4	4	1	9,00	5,0	5	5	15,00
5	4	3	4	11,00	5,0	4	3	12,00
6	4	5	4	13,00	2,5	3	4	9,50
7	3	4	2	9,00	5,0	4	5	14,00
8	4	4	4	12,00	4,5	3	3	10,50
9	5	5	2	12,00	4,0	4	4	12,00
10	3	5	4	12,00	4,0	5	4	13,00
11	4	3	2	9,00	3,0	4	4	11,00
12	2	4	4	10,00	4,5	3	5	12,50
13	4	5	3	12,00	4,0	4	5	13,00
14	4	5	4	13,00	4,5	5	5	13,50
15	4	4	5	13,00	5,0	5	4	14,00
Group B	C 5.7	tf 5.7	V 5.7	Mean	C 6.7	tf 6.7	V 6.7	Mean
1	4	5	4	13,00	5,0	4	5	14,00
2	3	4	4	11,00	4,0	4	4	12,00
3	1	4	5	10,00	2,5	5	2	9,50
4	3	3	5	11,00	5,0	5	5	15,00
5	4	5	2	11,00	5,0	5	4	14,00
6	4	5	4	13,00	4,5	5	5	14,50
7	4	5	3	12,00	5,0	5	4	14,00
8	3	1	3	7,00	4,0	4	5	13,00
9	2	3	4	9,00	3,0	5	5	13,00
10	3	3	5	11,00	4,0	5	5	14,00
11	4	5	5	14,00	4,0	3	5	12,00
12	4	5	2	11,00	3,0	4	5	12,00
13	3	5	3	11,00	4,5	5	5	14,50
14	3	4	4	11,00	2,5	4	5	11,50
15	4	5	4	13,00	5,0	4	5	14,00

APPENDIX D (continued)
Mean of text 1,3,5 and 2,4,6 within Group A

Number of valid observations (listwise) =45

Text	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
1,3,5	10,69	1,98	4,5	13,75
2,4,6	9,06	3,05	3	15

t= 2,98 p<0,05

Mean of text 1,3,5 and 2,4,6 within Group B

Number of valid observations (listwise) =45

Text	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
1,3,5	10,99	2,10	6,60	14
2,4,6	9,38	3,32	3	15

t= 2,83 p> 0,05

Mean of Components within Group A

Number of valid observations (listwise) = 45

Text	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
c.1,3,5	3,69	,81	1,75	5,00
c.2,4,6	3,26	1,16	1,00	5,00
tf.1,3,5	4,07	,72	3,00	5,00
tf.2,4,6	3,78	,82	2,00	5,00
v.1,3,5	3,00	1,33	0,00	5,00
v.2,4,6	2,02	1,78	0,00	5,00

Mean of Components within Group B

Number of valid observations (listwise) = 45

c.1,3,5	3,79	0,85	1,00	5,00
c.2,4,6	3,11	1,26	1,00	5,00
tf.1,3,5	4,00	1,04	1,00	5,00
tf.2,4,6	4,04	0,85	2,00	5,00
v.1,3,5	3,20	1,53	0,00	5,00
v.2,4,6	2,20	1,98	0,00	5,00

APPENDIX E

Frequency Distributions

Frequency Distributions of each Test Result in Group A

1 A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	9,750	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	10,000	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	11,000	2	1,5	13,3	26,7
	11,500	2	1,5	13,3	40,0
	11,750	3	2,2	20,0	60,0
	12,000	1	0,7	6,7	66,7
	12,750	2	1,5	13,3	80,0
	13,000	2	1,5	13,3	93,3
	13,750	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

2 A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,000	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	4,000	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	6,000	1	0,7	6,7	20,0
	7,000	5	3,6	33,3	53,3
	8,000	2	1,5	13,3	66,7
	9,000	3	2,2	20,0	86,7
	9,500	1	0,7	6,7	93,3
	11,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

3 A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	4,500	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	6,000	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	7,000	1	0,7	6,7	20,0
	8,600	1	0,7	6,7	26,7
	8,800	2	1,5	13,3	40,0
	9,000	1	0,7	6,7	46,7
	10,000	3	2,2	20,0	66,7
	11,000	3	2,2	20,0	86,7
	12,000	1	0,7	6,7	93,3
	13,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

4 A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	5,000	2	1,5	13,3	13,3
	6,000	4	2,9	26,7	40,0
	7,000	3	2,2	20,0	60,0
	8,000	3	2,2	20,0	80,0
	9,000	2	1,5	13,3	93,3
	10,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

5 A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	9,000	5	3,6	33,3	33,3
	10,000	2	1,5	13,3	46,7
	11,000	1	0,7	6,7	53,3
	12,000	4	2,9	26,7	80,0
	13,000	3	2,2	20,0	100,0

6 A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	9,500	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	10,500	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	11,000	1	0,7	6,7	20,0
	12,000	4	2,9	26,7	46,7
	12,500	1	0,7	6,7	53,3
	13,000	2	1,5	13,3	66,7
	14,000	3	2,2	20,0	86,7
	14,000	1	0,7	6,7	93,3
	15,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)**Frequency Distributions of each Test Result in Group B**

1 B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	8,750	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	11,000	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	11,500	1	0,7	6,7	20,0
	11,750	1	0,7	6,7	26,7
	12,000	3	2,2	20,0	46,7
	13,000	4	2,9	26,7	73,3
	14,000	4	2,9	26,7	100,0

2 B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,000	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	6,000	4	2,9	26,7	33,3
	7,000	4	2,9	26,7	60,0
	8,000	3	2,2	20,0	80,0
	9,000	2	1,5	13,3	93,3
	11,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

3 B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	6,600	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	7,000	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	8,000	2	1,5	13,3	26,7
	8,600	1	0,7	6,7	33,3
	8,800	1	0,7	6,7	40,0
	9,000	3	2,2	20,0	60,0
	9,600	1	0,7	6,7	66,7
	9,800	1	0,7	6,7	73,3
	10,000	1	0,7	6,7	80,0
	11,000	2	1,5	13,3	93,3
	14,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

4 B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	5,000	3	2,2	20,0	20,0
	6,000	1	0,7	6,7	26,7
	7,000	6	4,4	40,0	66,7
	9,000	2	1,5	13,3	80,0
	11,000	1	0,7	6,7	86,7
	12,000	1	0,7	6,7	93,3
	13,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

5 B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	7,000	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	9,000	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	10,000	1	0,7	6,7	20,0
	11,000	7	5,1	46,7	66,7
	12,000	1	0,7	6,7	73,3
	13,000	3	2,2	20,0	93,3
	14,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

6 B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	9,500	1	0,7	6,7	6,7
	11,500	1	0,7	6,7	13,3
	12,000	3	2,2	20,0	33,3
	13,000	2	1,5	13,3	46,7
	14,000	5	3,6	33,3	80,0
	14,500	2	1,5	13,3	93,3
	15,000	1	0,7	6,7	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

Frequency Distribution of each Component in each Text for Group A and Group B

c1.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,75	1	0,01	6,7	6,7
	4,00	7	0,8	46,7	53,3
	4,50	1	0,1	6,7	60,0
	4,75	1	0,1	6,7	66,7
	5,00	5	0,6	33,3	100,0

c1.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,75	1	0,1	6,7	6,7
	2,75	1	0,1	6,7	13,3
	3,00	2	0,2	13,3	26,7
	3,50	2	0,2	13,3	40,0
	3,75	3	0,4	20,0	60,0
	4,00	3	0,4	20,0	80,0
	4,75	2	0,2	13,3	93,3
	5,00	1	0,1	6,7	100,0

c2.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	1	0,1	6,7	6,7
	2,00	7	0,8	46,7	53,3
	3,00	4	0,5	26,7	80,0
	4,00	2	0,2	13,3	93,3
	5,00	1	0,1	6,7	100,0

c2A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	3	0,4	20,0	20,0
	2,00	3	0,4	20,0	40,0
	3,00	6	0,7	40,0	80,0
	3,50	1	0,1	6,7	86,7
	4,00	2	0,2	13,3	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

c3.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,60	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	2,80	1	,1	6,7	13,3
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	33,3
	3,60	2	,2	13,3	46,7
	3,80	1	,1	6,7	53,3
	4,00	5	,6	33,3	86,7
	5,00	2	,2	13,3	100,0

c3.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,50	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	2,80	1	,1	6,7	13,3
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	40,0
	3,60	1	,1	6,7	46,7
	3,80	1	,1	6,7	53,7
	400	3	,4	20,0	73,3
	5,00	4	,5	26,7	100,0

c4.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	3	,4	20	20
	2,00	5	,6	33,3	53,3
	3,00	3	,4	20	73,3
	4,00	3	,4	20	93,3
	5,00	1	,1	6,7	100,0

c4.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	2,00	4	,5	26,7	33,3
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	60,0
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

tf1.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	33,3
	4,00	5	,6	33,3	66,7
	5,00	5	6	33,3	100,0

tf1.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	20,0
	4,00	8	,9	53,3	73,3
	5,00	4	,5	26,7	100,0

tf2.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	33,3
	4,00	7	,8	46,7	80,0
	5,00	3	,4	20,0	100,0

tf2. A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	2	,2	13,3	13,3
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	33,3
	4,00	7	,8	46,7	80,0
	5,00	3	,4	20,0	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

tf3.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	2	,2	13,3	13,3
	3,00	2	,2	13,3	26,7
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	66,7
	5,00	5	,6	33,0	100,0

tf3.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	2,00	1	,1	6,7	13,3
	3,00	1	,1	6,7	33,3
	4,00	8	,9	33,3	73,3
	5,00	4	,5	26,7	100,0

tf4.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	33,3
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	73,3
	5,00	4	,5	26,7	100,0

tf4.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,00	9	1,1	60,0	60,0
	4,00	5	,6	33,0	93,3
	5,00	1	,1	7,6	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

tf5.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	26,7
	4,00	3	,4	20,0	46,7
	5,00	8	,9	53,3	100,0

tf5.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	26,7
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	66,7
	5,00	5	,6	33,3	100,0

tf6.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	46,7
	5,00	8	,9	53,3	100,0

tf6.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	20,0
	4,00	7	,8	46,7	66,7
	5,00	5	,6	33,3	100,0

v1.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	4,00	11	1,3	73,3	80,0
	5,00	3	,4	20,0	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

v1.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	4,00	14	1,6	93,3	93,3
	5,00	1	,1	6,7	100,0

v2.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0,00	6	,7	40,0	40,0
	1,00	7	,8	46,7	86,7
	2,00	2	,2	13,3	100,0

v2.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0,00	4	,5	26,7	26,7
	1,00	6	,7	40,0	66,7
	2,00	4	,5	26,7	33,3
	3,00	1	,2	6,7	100,0

v3.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0,00	4	,5	26,7	6,26,7
	1,00	3	,4	20,0	46,7
	2,00	5	,6	33,3	80,0
	3,00	1	,1	6,7	86,7
	4,00	1	,1	6,7	93,3
	5,00	1	,1	6,7	100,0

v3.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0,00	2	,2	13,3	13,3
	1,00	6	,7	40,0	53,3
	2,00	1	,1	96,7	60,0
	3,00	6	,7	40,0	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

v4.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0,00	5	,6	33,3	33,3
	1,00	6	,7	40,0	73,3
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	93,3
	4,00	1	,1	6,7	100,0

v4.A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0,00	6	,7	40,0	40,0
	1,00	8	,9	53,3	93,3
	2,00	1	,1	6,7	100,0

v5B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	2	,2	13,3	13,3
	3,00	3	,4	20,0	33,3
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	73,3
	5,00	4	,5	26,7	100,0

v5A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	2,00	3	,4	20,0	26,7
	3,00	4	,5	26,7	53,3
	4,00	6	,7	40,0	93,3
	5,00	1	,1	6,7	100,0

v6.B

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2,00	1	,1	6,7	6,7
	4,00	3	,4	20,0	26,7
	5,00	11	1,3	73,3	100,0

APPENDIX E (continued)

v6.A	Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
		3,00	2	,2	13,3	13,3
		4,00	7	,8	46,7	60,0
		5,00	6	,7	40,0	100,0